DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 191 996 CE 025 936

AUTHOR Harvey, Edward B.
TITLE Barriers to Employer Sponsored Training in Ontario. Results of a Field Study.
SPONS AGENCY Ontario Ministry of Colleges and Universities, Toronto.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-7743-4932-8
PUB DATE 80
NOTE 120p.
AVAILABLE FROM Ontario Government Bookstores, 880 Bay St., Toronto, Ontario M7A 1I2 CA ($3.50)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Apprenticeships; Attitudes; Employer Attitudes; Employers; Government Role; *Industrial Training; *Institutional Characteristics; Interviews; On the Job Training; *Organization Size (Groups); Public Policy; Schools; Skilled Workers; State Surveys; Unions
IDENTIFIERS *Ontario

ABSTRACT

Results of a field survey of Canadian companies, trade unions, employer associations, educational establishments, and government agencies regarding the extent and possibilities of employer-sponsored training for workers are compiled in this report. Concentrating on the forty-nine companies in the survey sample, with collateral data from the twenty-one other sources, the report begins in chapter 1 with a statement of the research question and an overview of the project. Chapter 2 provides details of data and methods used in the field survey--sampling, interview schedules, definitions, data gathering, and data analysis. Chapter 3 profiles the forty-nine companies in which interviews were conducted, thirty of which were engaged in employer-sponsored training. It takes into account their size, geographical location, unionization status, and use of government-sponsored training programs. Chapter 4 presents a more detailed analysis of the companies, comparing training and non-training firms on such issues as perceptions of barriers to employer-sponsored training and willingness to assume principal responsibility for training (as opposed to looking to government for training responsibility). Chapter 5 examines interview results on attitudes and experiences of the twenty-one other organizations with regard to employer-sponsored training, and identifies proposals for government action. Chapter 6 reports the principal conclusions. Appendices contain characteristics of the organizations and interview schedules. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED191996

BARRIERS TO EMPLOYER SPONSORED TRAINING IN ONTARIO

Results of a Field Survey

EDWARD B. HARVEY, Principal Investigator

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Minister of Colleges & Universities, Ontario
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

This research report was funded under contract by the Ministry of Colleges and Universities, Ontario. It reflects the views of the author and not necessarily those of the Ministry.

Hon. Bette Stephenson, M.D., Minister
Dr. H. K. Fisher, Deputy Minister

CE 025 936

AUG 7 1980

© The Minister of Colleges and Universities, Ontario, 1980
Queen's Park
Toronto, Ontario

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION / MINISTRY OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
CATALOGUING IN PUBLICATION

Harvey, Edward B.
Barriers to employer sponsored training in Ontario : results of a field survey : a study / prepared for the Ministry of Colleges and Universities (Ontario) by Edward B. Harvey. --

1. Employees, Training of - Ontario. I. Ontario. Ministry of Colleges and Universities. II. Title.

ON01767 658.3124 UTLAS: 54010403

ISBN 0-7743-4932-8

Additional copies may be ordered from:

Publications Sales
The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
252 Bloor Street West
Toronto, Ontario
M5S 1V6

or from:

The Ontario Government Bookstore
880 Bay Street
Toronto, Ontario
M7A 1L2

1 2 3 4 5 XX 48 38 28 18 08

Contents

Tables and Exhibit/vi

Acknowledgments/vii

1 Introduction/1

2 Data and Methods/3

3 Basic Profile of Companies/13

4 Training: Companies' Attitudes and Experiences/20

5 Training: The Views of Other Constituencies/44

6 Conclusions/57

Appendix A: Selected Characteristics of Organizations in Which Interviews Were Carried Out/67

Appendix B: Interview Schedules/73

Tables and Exhibit

TABLE

2:1/Total Sample, Target Sample, and Response Sample Compared by Organization Type /4

2:2/Characteristics of the Response Sample (companies only) /7

3:1/Companies by Population of Nearest Community /13

3:2/Major Occupational Groups Identified in Connection with Training /14

3:3/Companies by Type of Training /14

3:4/Companies by Types of Government-Supported Training Used in Past Five Years /15

3:5/Training and Non-Training Firms by Industry /16

3:6/Training and Non-Training Firms by Region /16

3:7/Training and Non-Training Firms by Population of Nearest Community /17

3:8/Training and Non-Training by Size (number of employees) /17

3:9/Training and Non-Training Firms by Union Status /17

3:10/Major Occupational Groups Identified in Connection with Training /18

4:1/Financial/Structural Aspects of Training Programs: Deterrents for Firms without and Actual Effects upon Firms with Training Programs /22

4:2/"How Should Government (any level) and This Organization Divide Responsibility for Training?" /24

4:3/Type of Training for Which Government Should Offer Greater Support /26

4:4/Type of Evaluation for Which Government Should Offer Greater Support /27

4:5/Previous Knowledge of Government-Supported Programs for Training /28

4:6/Training and Non-Training Firms by Types of Government-Supported Training Used in Past Five Years /28

4:7/"Do You Believe That Employer Sponsored Training Should or Should Not Provide the Trainee with Portable Skills within the Industry?" 29

4:8/"What Would You Say about the Present Education and Career Guidance in the School System?" /30

4:9/Factors Perceived to Affect Firm's Ability to Attract and Keep Trainees /31

4:10/"How Often Do You Have a Shortage of Applicants for Your Training Program?" /33

4:11/Percentage of Trainees Leaving before Completion of Training /33

4:12/Destination of Trainees Who Leave before Completion of Training /34

4:13/Percentage of Trainees Leaving within Two Years of Completion of Training /34

4:14/Effect of Union on Aspects of Training Program /35

4:15/Use and Non-Use of Government Support Programs /37

4:16/Effect of Government Guidelines on Aspects of Training Program /37

4:17/"Do You Depend upon Any Educational Institutions for Part of Your Training Program?" /38

4:18/Issues of Concern to Firms Regarding Use of Educational Institutions in Training /38

4:19/Source of Skilled Workers for Non-Training Firms /39

4:20/Difficulty for Non-Training Firms in Attracting Skilled Labour /40

4:21/"Is There a Skilled Labour Shortage in Your Industry?" /40

4:22/Perceived Union Position on Development of Training /40

4:23/Conflict with Union Expected by Unionized Non-Training Firms /41

5:1/Distribution of Interviews Carried Out in Other Constituencies /45

EXHIBIT

5:1/Comparison of Duties of Joint Apprenticeship Committees in Two Union Clauses /54

Acknowledgments

I would like to acknowledge with thanks the contributions made to this study by Vivian Crossman, Anne Ford, and Steven L. McShane.

1 Introduction

There is growing evidence that the manpower training and development needs of industry in Ontario would be well served by more employer and union sponsored training. The greater use of such training could do much to guarantee more adequate and predictable supplies of skilled labour, as well as the relevance of the skills to actual industrial requirements, and would further provide a useful alternative to institution-based training that may not be accessible to all adolescents or adult workers.

Despite the apparent benefits of employer and union sponsored training, it appears that the development and use of such training remains at an unacceptably low level. In order to identify and analyse the various factors contributing to this situation, the Ministry of Colleges and Universities in January 1978 issued a request for proposals in respect to the study of "Barriers to Employer Sponsored Training in Ontario." Specifically, the major objectives of the proposed study are as follows:

- to investigate the incentives and disincentives for employer sponsored training as reported in existing literature and supplemented or modified by field survey information
- to prepare an inventory of the perceived barriers to employer sponsored training ranked in order of significance and analysed to reveal differences among constituent groups
- to investigate the perceptions of employers and other interested groups of changes needed in government legislation and supporting policies and practices with respect to employer sponsored training as reported in existing literature and supplemented or modified by field survey information
- to report the results of the above studies.

A report in respect of the literature review component was tabled in September 1978. Work on the field survey component commenced shortly thereafter. This document is a report of the field survey.

8

The field survey data were gathered in the course of personal interviews conducted with 49 companies in Ontario and 21 other organizations representing such constituencies as educational establishments, employer associations, government agencies, and unions. Of the 49 companies involved, 30 were engaged in employer sponsored training and the remaining 19 were not.

We now provide a brief overview of the contents of this report. Chapter 2 provides details on the data and methods used in the field survey. Such issues as sample design, definitions of concepts and terms used in the study, the design of interview schedules, and methods of data analysis are discussed in this chapter. Chapter 3 sets forward basic profile information on the 49 companies in which interviews were conducted. Information is included on their unionization status, their use of government-supported training programs, and variations in their propensity to train and not to train by such factors as region and size.

Chapter 4 presents a more detailed analysis of the 49 companies. A number of comparisons are made between training and non-training firms with respect to such issues as perceptions of various barriers to employer sponsored training and willingness to assume principal responsibility for various aspects of training (i.e., as opposed to looking to government to assume a larger degree of responsibility). In addition to the various comparisons made between training and non-training firms, a number of specific analyses are made with respect to training firms alone and to non-training firms alone.

Chapter 5 examines the attitudes and experiences of a number of other constituencies with respect to employer sponsored training. This information is based upon interviews carried out in 21 other organizations, including educational establishments, employer associations, government agencies, and unions. A number of barriers to employer sponsored training, identified in the course of these interviews, are discussed and analysed. In addition, incentives or facilitating conditions are identified, as are various constituency-specific proposals for government action.

Chapter 6 sets forward the principal conclusions arising from the field study.

Two appendices are presented in this report. The first identifies selected characteristics of the organizations in which interviews were conducted; the second presents the interview schedules used in the gathering of the field survey data.

2 Data and Methods

I. INTRODUCTION

This chapter outlines the principal characteristics of the data and methods used in the field study and discusses the approach to sampling taken. General information is provided on the characteristics of the organizations in which interviews were conducted.

This chapter also provides information on the design of the interview schedules used, the definitions of a number of the principal concepts or terms frequently used in this report, and various details on the data gathering and data analysis phases.

II. SAMPLE DESIGN

The size and composition of the sample used in this study was arrived at judgmentally in the course of consultations with senior officials of the Industrial Training Council in October and November 1978. In particular, these discussions focussed on ways and means of obtaining an acceptable trade-off between size and scope of sample and the limitations imposed by the funding available for the study. In this section, we provide further details on the constituencies selected in our sampling process, the target numbers of respondents we attempted to obtain in each constituency, the general selection guidelines that governed the sampling process, characteristics of the respondents to the survey, and a brief analysis of some of the aspects of non-response to the survey.

Constituencies Selected

Five types of organizations that were thought to have relevance to the investigation were selected. These included companies involved and not involved in training, unions, employer associations, educational establish-

ments, and government agencies. In keeping with the primary objective of this study, the principal focus was on companies. The four other constituent groups were included for the purposes of assembling preliminary information pertinent to an understanding of the larger context of barriers to and incentives for employer sponsored training. We now turn to a discussion of the numbers sampled.

Target Sample

As may be seen from table 2:1, our objective was to complete field interviews with fifty companies, three trade unions, five employer associations, ten educational establishments, and two government agencies. Working on the assumption that at least some of those organizations selected would not participate, we deliberately selected twice as many organizations as our target requirement for each of the five constituent groups. As may be seen from the table, we were able to realize our target sample requirements with two minor exceptions. The first of these is that 49 rather than 50 companies were interviewed and six rather than five employer associations were interviewed.[1]

TABLE 2:1/Total Sample, Target Sample, and Response Sample Compared by Organization Type

Type of organization	Total sample	Target sample	Response sample
Companies	100	50	49
Unions	6	3	3
Employer associations	10	5	6
Educational establishments	20	10	10
Government agencies	4	2	2
Totals	140	70	70

Sample Selection Guidelines

Both in the design of the total sample and in the pursuit of our sample target, three general selection guidelines were observed. First, where relevant, we attempted to ensure that the organizations sampled would be broadly representative of the four major geographical regions of the province of Ontario.[2] Second, where relevant, we attempted to ensure

that the companies selected represented the range of industries which had been agreed upon in consultation with senior officials of the Industrial Training Council. This range included chemical, rubber, and petroleum processing, precision instrument manufacturing, sheet metal fabricating, machining, hardware sales (both wholesale and retail), dry cleaning and laundering, and the hotel and motel industry.[3] This selection was considered to be broadly representative of the combination of high-technology, middle-technology, and service industries that characterize the mixed economy of Ontario. Third, where relevant, an attempt was made to ensure that the companies were representative of different size groupings. As the foregoing comments imply, not all of the sample selection criteria were considered to be equally applicable to the five types of organizations studied. In our view, the guidelines relating to region, industry type, and size (as measured by number of employees) were all pertinent to companies. With respect to trade unions and employer associations, it was our view that only industry type was applicable. Finally, with respect to educational establishments and government agencies, the regional representation guideline was operative. The sample selection criteria can thus be summarized as follows:

Type of organization	*Represent regions:*	*Represent different industries:*	*Represent different size groups:*
Companies	x	x	x
Unions		x	
Employer associations		x	
Educational establishments	x		
Government agencies	x		

The communities where interviews were conducted by geographical region are as follows:

Northern Ontario	*Southwestern Ontario*	*Central Ontario*	*Southeastern Ontario*
Bracebridge	London	Brampton	Belleville
Gravenhurst	Sarnia	Don Mills	Bells Corners
Midland	Windsor	Rexdale	Brockville
North Bay	Woodstock	Toronto (city)	Kingston
Orillia		Vaughn	Millhaven
Parry Sound		Weston	Ottawa
Sudbury		Willowdale	
		Scarborough	

Characteristics of the Response Sample

This section provides further information on the 70 organizations in which interviews were conducted. It should be pointed out that as a commitment to confidentiality was made during the course of the interviews, specific organizations will not be identified by name. Appendix A to this report does, however, provide additional information on their characteristics. In the case of the companies, information is provided on industry type, location, number of employees, union status, and whether or not the company had a training program. In the case of those companies which did have training programs, further detail is provided on the type of training program. With respect to the other types of organizations in which interviews were conducted, these are identified by type and location.

The three unions in which interviews were conducted represented workers in three major areas of the economy: the automobile and aerospace industry; the electrical, radio, and machine industry; and the steel industry. The six employer associations represented machinery and equipment manufacturing, chemical production, industrial instrument manufacturing, retail hardware, dry cleaning and laundering, and the hotel and motel industry. With respect to educational establishments, interviews were carried out in four community colleges representing each of the four major geographical regions of Ontario, in four boards of education which also represented the four geographical regions, and in two private trade schools. With respect to government agencies, interviews were carried out in two branch offices of a department of the Ontario government concerned with industrial training, one in the southwestern part and the other in the southeastern part of the province.

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the interviews carried out with the unions, employer associations, educational establishments, and government agencies were designed to gather preliminary information that would be useful in developing a better understanding of the general context for employer sponsored training. The principal focus of the present study, however, was on the companies and in particular on companies that are involved in training programs and those that are not. Table 2:2 provides further information on the 49 companies.

An effort was made to ensure that companies in which interviews were conducted represented different size groupings, as measured by number of employees. A similar effort was made to ensure a reasonably

equitable regional distribution of the companies. As may be seen from the table, the response sample reflected both these considerations.

TABLE 2:2/Characteristics of the Response Sample (companies only)

Industry Type	%	(N)
Chemical, rubber, and petroleum processing	19	(9)
Precision instruments	6	(3)
Sheet metal fabrication	16	(8)
Machining	29	(14)
Hardware (wholesale and retail)	12	(6)
Dry cleaning and laundering	8	(4)
Hotels	10	(5)
Totals	100	(49)
Size (Number of Employees)	%	(N)
Less than 50	35	(17)
50 - 200	29	(14)
Greater than 200	36	(18)
Totals	100	(49)
Region	%	(N)
Northern Ontario	27	(13)
Southwestern Ontario	22	(11)
Central Ontario	27	(13)
Southeastern Ontario	24	(12)
Totals	100	(49)

III. INTERVIEW SCHEDULES

Six interview schedules were prepared for use with six categories of respondents: companies with training programs; companies without training programs; unions; employer associations; educational establishments including community colleges, boards of education, and private trade schools; and government agencies. Although separate instruments were designed for each category, wherever possible questions were framed to permit comparisons of the data across categories as well as within them. The interview

schedules are reproduced in Appendix B of this report.

Initial versions of the six questionnaires were discussed with senior officials of the Industrial Training Council in November 1978. These instruments were field tested during the first two weeks of December, further refined and shortened, and then used over the next two months during which the interviews took place.

As much as possible, the questions used in the interview schedules were pre-structured in order to facilitate the classification and quantitative analysis of responses. However, in a number of instances, open-ended questions were also provided to allow respondents an opportunity to offer more qualitative types of information.

IV. DEFINITIONS

In the interests of clarity and consistency of usage, we now define a number of terms that are frequently used in the course of this report. Given the principal focus of this study, the definition of "employer sponsored training" represents a critical starting point. In this connection, the definition we use is the same as that set forward in the request for proposal document governing this study.

Employer Sponsored Training

Basically, "employer sponsored training" refers to a type of training wherein the trainee is employed and his or her employer and/or trade union participates in the training process. This participation may take the form of an apprenticeship arrangement, which is defined below, or an in-house training program which meets the criteria set forward below for "employer sponsored training." It should be noted that in some instances the organization involved in training may choose to use both apprenticeship and in-house programs to meet training needs. To qualify for description in this report as "employer sponsored training" (which includes apprenticeship and in-house training as sub-sets), a training program must meet the following criteria:

1. Intent--to qualify employees or union members to perform or to improve job-related performance in an employment setting.
2. Agency--an employer and/or union which jointly or separately initiate, by arranging for and/or funding, the training.
3. Location--on employer, union, and/or college premises.
4. Target Group--for youths or adults either employed or seeking work.
5. Length--must be 30 hours or more of formal classroom and/or on-the-job instruction.
6. Level--to exclude degree programs or courses for credit towards a university degree.

7. Curriculum Content--to include job skills and knowledge, attitudes, and/or management training.

8. Curriculum Planning--to lead to a structured pre-arranged system of training and development including:
   (a) an analysis of the work for which training is sponsored, outlining the functions, skill knowledge, and attitudes required to meet performance standards;
   (b) measurable objectives, i.e., the behavioural changes expected as a result of the training;
   (c) a training schedule specifying the subject content;
   (d) a prescribed methodology and location in which training is given;
   (e) evaluation criteria.

The group without previous experience will be considered to be the balance of employers in the survey population, based on data collected in the survey instrument.

Institutional Training
Theoretical or skills training that occurs at a school such as a community college, high school, or private trade school but not at a university (for the purposes of this study). Institutional training also includes any other formal instruction in a classroom setting such as on the union or company premises.

On-the-Job Training
Training that occurs on the actual work site where the production or service is carried on. That is, on-the-job training does not include classroom instruction.

Apprenticeship Training
A formalized system of training administered in Ontario by the Industrial Training Branch. The program content for each apprenticeable occupation--whether a voluntary or compulsory certification program--is determined by the corresponding Ontario Regulations. Apprenticeship programs meet the requirements of employer sponsored training outlined above.

In-House Training
Any program of training that satisfies the definition of employer sponsored training but is not an apprenticeship program. In-house training may be developed and supported either by a company alone or with government involvement (such as through the Canada Manpower Industrial Training Program, Job Experience Training program, Training in Business and Industry, and others).

Time-Based Evaluation
A form of trainee evaluation that is based solely upon the amount of time that has been spent either in the program or at specific tasks in a training capacity.

Proficiency-Test Evaluation
This form of evaluation tests the trainee's knowledge of the theoretical and/or practical content of the training program through either written or "hands-on" examination.

Poaching
Hiring by a company of labour trained and currently working at another company rather than developing the skills of its own employees to meet its manpower needs.

Portable Skills
Portable skills are those skills that are useful to the training organization and to other organizations. This is opposed to non-portable skills, which are of value only in the training organization.

Skill Upgrading
Skill upgrading refers to the further development of knowledge and experience of a worker who already possesses at least the basic skills that the training firm requires. This process of training is often used to groom the worker for a more advanced position in the company and may occur several times during the worker's career.

Training vs. Non-Training Companies
For the purposes of this report, "training" companies (or companies "with training") refers to those companies that have an apprenticeship and/or in-house training program for their employees.

V. DATA GATHERING AND ANALYSIS

The data gathering for the present study was carried out between December 1978 and March 1979. Apart from the two minor exceptions alluded to earlier in this chapter, the sample targets were realized. In the course of the study 82 organizations were contacted. Of this number, 70 agreed to participate in the study and 12 declined. The study thus had an overall response rate of 85%. Of those 12 organizations which declined to participate, 10 were companies, one was a trade union, and one was an employer association. In 11 of the 12 instances the stated reason for declining to participate was a lack of time; in the remaining instance the respondent contacted indicated that he had no use for such studies and would not participate. We examined the characteristics of the non-responders and could find no evidence of systematic bias relating to size, region, or industrial type.

The data obtained from the 49 companies were coded and analysed by computer. With respect to the data gathered on the other organizations, because of the small numbers involved the data were tabulated by hand and analysed without the use of the computer.

The methods of analysis used in this report emphasize a straight-

forward examination of the data that will serve to identify as clearly as possible the policy and program development implications of the information obtained. The data are analysed with respect to the various constituent groups studied, and also, where possible, comparisons are made across constituent groups.

Given the non-probabilistic character of the sampling techniques used in the study, it is our judgment that tests of statistical significance would not be appropriate and they therefore have not been used.

NOTES

1. Using our substitution procedures we would, of course, have been able to select another company and achieve our target of fifty company interviews. However, the opportunity to carry out an interview in another employer association arose, and it was our judgment that the data from that interview would be a valuable contribution to the study.

2. The following constitutes the composition by planning region (county, district, or regional municipality) of the four geographical divisions used in this study.

Central	Southeast	Southwest	North
Durham	Glengarry	Essex	Bruce
York	Prescott	Kent	Grey
Metro Toronto	Russell	Lambton	Muskoka
Peel	Stormont	Middlesex	Haliburton
Halton	Dundas	Elgin	Renfrew (part)
Hamilton-Wentworth	Ottawa-Carleton	Haldimand-Norfolk	Nipissing
Niagara	Grenville	Brant	Parry Sound
Dufferin	Leeds	Oxford	Sudbury (and Sudbury RM)
Simcoe (south part, not including Orillia)	Lanark	Waterloo	Algoma
	Frontenac	Wellington	Simcoe (north part, including Orillia)
	Lennox and Addington	Perth	Manitoulin
	Renfrew (part)	Huron	Timiskaming
	Hastings		Cochrane
	Northumberland		Thunder Bay
	Peterborough		Rainy River
	Victoria		Kenora
	Prince Edward		

3. The seven industrial groups represented in this study correspond to selected groupings found at the three-digit level of the *Standard Industrial Classification Manual* (Ottawa: Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Information Canada, December 1970, Catalogue No. 12-501). The following constitutes the correspondence between the industrial groups used in this study and the Standard Industrial Classification Codes.

Industrial Group	Standard Industrial Classification Code
Chemical, rubber, and petroleum processing	165, 373, 375, 378

Precision instruments	318, 391
Sheetmetal fabrication	301, 303, 304, 307
Machining operations	305, 306, 309, 315, 336
Hardware sales (wholesale and retail)	624, 673
Dry cleaners and launderers	874
Hotels	881

3 Basic Profile of Companies

I. INTRODUCTION

The foregoing chapter provided some basic information on the 49 companies in which interviews were conducted with respect to industrial type, regional location, and size as measured by number of employees. This section provides further basic profile information. We begin with an examination of selected basic profile characteristics for all 49. Later in this chapter, comparisons are made between training and non-training companies.

II. BASIC PROFILE OF COMPANIES

Of the 49 companies, 25 were unionized and 24 were not. The size of the community in which the companies are located or to which they are proximate may be seen from table 3:1.

Table 3:1/Companies by Population of Nearest Community (N=49)

Population	%
Under 50,000	26
50,000 - 299,999	39
300,000 and over	35
Total	100

Respondents in firms with training were asked to identify the major occupational groups to which their present training initiatives were principally directed. In the case of non-training firms, respondents were

asked to identify those major occupational groups to which they would direct their training efforts if they were to become involved in training.[1] As may be seen from table 3:2, the occupational group most frequently referred to was machining, which includes such occupations as sheetmetal workers, welders, mould makers, tool and die makers, and machinists. The next most frequently mentioned was the service group, which includes such occupations as chefs, cooks, food and beverage waiters, and laundry and dry clearning workers.

Table 3:2/ Major Occupational Groups Identified in Connection with Training (N=49)

Occupational Group	%
Sales	8
Service	21
Processing	12
Machining	37
Product fabricating, assembling, repairing	12
Material handling	2
Not stated	8
Total	100

Table 3:3 provides information on the distribution of training activities in the 49 companies. As may be seen from this table, 10% of the companies made use of apprenticeship only to meet their training requirements. A further 10% used both apprenticeship and in-house training. By far the largest proportion (41%) used in-house training only. The

Table 3:3/ Companies by Type of Training (N=49)

Type of Training	%
Apprenticeship only	10
Both apprenticeship and in-house	10
In-house only	41
No training	39
Total	100

remaining 39% were not engaged in training of either type.

Among those companies that were involved in some form of industrial training, we were interested in obtaining information on the type of government support such companies had made use of in connection with their training activities. As may be seen from table 3:4, the largest proportion of companies (27%) made use of government support via apprenticeship. Next most used was the Canada Manpower Industrial Training Program (CMITP) at 22%, the Job Experience Training Program (JET) at 12%, and Training in Business and Industry (TIBI) at 2%. Other government programs accounted for 6%. In all, 39% of companies reported that they had received no recent government support for training, this being defined as having received support within the past five years.

Table 3:4/Companies by Types of Government-Supported Training Used in Past Five Years (N=49)

Type of government support	%
Apprenticeship	27
Canada Manpower Industrial Training Program (CMIPT)	22
Job Experience Training (JET)	12
Training in Business and Industry (TIBI)	2
Other government programs	6
No recent government support	39
Total	108*

*Totals more than 100% because some firms have used more than one government program.

III. TRAINING AND NON-TRAINING FIRMS COMPARED

We now proceed to compare firms that are engaged in some form of training and firms that do not train in terms of the various basic profile attributes set out above.

We turn first to table 3:5, which compares training and non-training companies by industry. Because of the very small numbers involved, we urge extreme caution in the interpretation of the percentage differences. However, by way of tentative assessment of the findings, it would appear that those firms most likely to train are engaged in the precision instrument industry, the hotel industry, the chemical and petroleum

industry, and the hardware industry. Firms engaged in machining industry are somewhat more likely to train than not train, while firms in the dry cleaning industry and sheet metal industry emerge as being more likely not to train than to train.

Table 3:5/Training and Non-Training Firms by Industry (N=49)

Type of industry	Training firms %	Non-training firms %	(N)	Totals %
Chemical/petroleum	78	22	(9)	100
Precision instruments	100	-	(3)	100
Sheet metal	38	62	(8)	100
Machining	57	43	(14)	100
Hardware	67	33	(6)	100
Dry cleaning	25	75	(4)	100
Hotel	80	20	(5)	100

With respect to regional comparisons between training and non-training companies, table 3:6 shows that the proportion of training firms to non-training firms is greatest in the central region and least in the north.

Table 3:6/Training and Non-Training Firms by Region

	Region			
	North (N=13) %	Southwest (N=11) %	Central (N=13) %	Southeast (N=12) %
Training firms	54	55	69	67
Non-training firms	46	45	31	33
Totals	100	100	100	100

With respect to the population of the community in which the company is located or to which it is proximate, as may be seen from table 3:7 the proportion of firms engaged in training (46%) is least in communities of less than 50,000 population. There is a much greater probability for firms to be engaged in training in communities with populations between 50,000 and 299,999 (68%) and over 300,000 (65%).

Table 3:8 examines the relationship between the size of a company

as measured by the number of employees and involvement or non-involvement in training. It would appear that large firms (that is, firms with 200 or more employees) are more likely to train (78%) than firms with 50 to 200 employees (50%) or with 50 or fewer employees (53%).

With respect to the union status of companies (table 3:9) it would

Table 3:7/Training and Non-Training Firms by Population of Nearest Community

	Population		
	Less than 50,000 (N=13) %	50,000-299,999 (N=19) %	300,000 and over (N=17) %
Training firms	46	68	65
Non-training firms	54	32	35
Totals	100	100	100

Table 3:8/Training and Non-Training Firms by Size (number of employees)

	No. of employees		
	Less than 50 (N=17) %	50-200 (N=14) %	Over 200 (N=18) %
Training firms	53	50	78
Non-training firms	47	50	22
Totals	100	100	100

Table 3:9/Training and Non-Training Firms by Union Status

	Unionized (N=24) %	Non-unionized (N=25) %
Training firms	63	60
Non-training firms	37	40
Totals	100	100

appear that this variable has no impact upon the propensity of a firm to train or not to train.

Finally, table 3:10 examines differences between training and non-training firms with respect to the occupational groups most frequently referred to by respondents in these firms as being the principal focus for present training initiatives (in training firms) or for training needs (in non-training firms). We would recommend considerable caution in the interpretation of the percentage differences, given the small numbers upon which they are based. This table suggests that a large proportion of companies in which the principal occupation for training is (or would be) material handling (100%), product fabricating, assembly, and repairing (83%), processing (83%), sales (75%), and service (60%) are in fact engaged in training. Firms are more likely to be non-training (56%) where machining is considered to be the principal occupation for training. This is particularly noteworthy since this last occupational group comprises, in numerical terms, the largest group in the table.

Table 3:10/Major Occupational Groups Identified in Connection with Training (training and non-training firms compared) (N=49)

Occupational groups	Training firms %	Non-training firms %	(N)	Totals %
Sales	75	25	(4)	100
Service	60	40	(10)	100
Processing	83	17	(6)	100
Machining	44	56	(18)	100
Product fabricating, assembly, repairing	83	17	(6)	100
Material handling	100	-	(1)	100
Not stated	50	50	(4)	100

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Interviews were carried out in 49 companies in Ontario. Of these 49 companies, 30 were engaged in some form of industrial training program that met the earlier-mentioned definition of employer sponsored training. The other 19 were not currently engaged in any form of industrial training that met the definition.

As the discussion of findings in both chapters 2 and 3 shows, approximately equal numbers of companies in the interviews represented

the four geographical regions of Ontario. An approximately equal proportion of unionized and non-unionized companies are also represented.

Of the seven types of industries represented, four were some form of manufacturing and three were service industries. No claim is made that this selection of industries is representative, in the sense of a probabilistic sampling design, of the industrial structure of Ontario. Similarly, no claim is made that the companies selected are representative, in the probabilistic sense, of all companies found in the industry groups in question. Limitations of funding and time rendered it infeasible to carry out a sufficient number of personal interviews to obtain such a degree of representation. Instead, it was decided in consultation with senior officials of the Industrial Training Council to select industries and companies on a judgmental basis. In the course of these discussions, the seven types of industries from which companies were selected were felt to be a rather reasonable compromise in representing the mixed nature of the Ontario economy and in ensuring that service as well as manufacturing establishments were included in the study.

As the findings discussed above clearly show, the propensity for firms to be involved in employer sponsored training programs is greatest in the highly industrialized and densely populated central region of the province. In addition, the likelihood of a company being involved in training is greater if the company is relatively larger as measured by number of employees.

NOTE

1. The occupational groups identified in this study correspond to the two-digit major group level of the *Occupational Classification Manual, Census of Canada, 1971, Vol. 2*, based on the *Canadian Classification and Dictionary of Occupations* (Ottawa: Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Information Canada, March 1971, Catalogue No. 12-537).

Occupational Group	CCDC Code
Sales	51
Service	61
Processing	81/82
Machining	83
Product fabricating, assembly, repairing	85
Naterial handling	93
Not stated	99

4 Training: Companies' Attitudes and Experiences

I. INTRODUCTION

In this chapter we undertake a more detailed analysis of the 49 companies in which interviews were carried out with respect to their attitudes toward and experiences with employer sponsored training. The principal objective of the data analysis is to discover barriers to and incentives or facilitating conditions for such training.

We begin by making a number of comparisons between the 30 firms that are involved in training and the 19 firms that are not. These analyses include an examination of various of the financial and structural aspects of training programs and the kinds of expectations and experiences our respondents reported with respect to their industrial-training-related relationships with government.

The next section focusses exclusively on the 30 firms that are engaged in training and examines a number of issues such as the use of government support for training by such firms, the ability of such firms to attract and keep trainees, experiences with shortages of applicants for training programs, and so on.

In section IV of this chapter we examine various aspects of firms that are not engaged in training. These issues include an examination of the source of skilled workers for such firms, difficulties such firms experience in attracting skilled workers, and experiences with shortages of skilled workers.

Section V presents selected other data analyses, for both training and non-training firms, with respect to such factors as their size and region.

II. TRAINING AND NON-TRAINING FIRMS COMPARED

In this section a number of comparisons are made between the 30 training firms and 19 non-training firms in our response sample. The differences between the two are examined in terms of three general areas of concern: the financial and structural aspects of training programs, expectations and relations with government, and other issues.

Financial/Structural Aspects of Training Programs

We were interested to learn more about how a variety of financial and/or structural aspects of training programs might operate as deterrents for non-training firms. We were also interested to learn more about how such financial and structural factors affected firms that were engaged in training. Table 4:1 sets forward a number of differences in this regard.

One of the most dramatic findings presented in the table is that whereas 71% of firms without training regard inadequate return on investment in training as a major or minor deterrent to becoming involved in a training program, only 14% of those firms involved in training report a negative effect in this connection. In fact, 69% of training firms report a positive effect with respect to return on investment in training.

It is evident that training may well conflict from time to time with the production process in any company. First, allowing released time for trainees may well not be compatible with production schedules. Second, it may well be that senior, skilled employees must also have released time to work as trainers--employees who are frequently critical to the production process. In this connection, 71% of firms without training reported that the conflict between training and production represented a major or minor deterrent to becoming involved in training. By comparison, only slightly over half (55%) of firms with training reported a negative effect.

Again, more of the firms without training (67%) viewed the cost of trainers as a deterrent factor, whereas only 40% of firms with training reported a negative effect. Similarly, more of the firms without training (56%) viewed the cost of administrative staff as a deterrent factor, whereas only 23% of firms with training reported a negative effect.

All of the findings discussed above suggest that with respect to a number of potential barriers or deterrents to the provision of training programs, the barrier or deterrent effect of these factors assumes a greater salience in non-training firms than in training firms. With one

TABLE 4:1/Financial/Structural Aspec[illegible]ning Programs: Deterrents for Firms without and Actual Effects upon Firms with Training Programs

	Non-training firms*			Training firms**			
	Major/minor deterrent %	No deterrent %	(N)	Negative effect %	No effect %	Positive effect %	(N)
Return on investment	71	29	(17)	14	17	69	(29)
Conflict of training with production	71	29	(17)	55	41	4	(22)
Cost of trainers	67	33	(18)	40	50	10	(30)
Cost of administrative staff	56	44	(18)	23	65	12	(28)
Availability of space for training	38	62	(16)	29	50	21	(24)
Availability of trainers	28	72	(18)	13	47	40	(30)
Cost of training aids	24	76	(17)	26	67	7	(27)
Availability of training aids	24	76	(17)	10	73	17	(30)
Availability of administrative staff	22	78	(18)	8	75	17	(24)

*Question: "Please indicate the extent to which the following issues have deterred this organization from implementing an employer sponsored training program."

**Question: "Please indicate to what extent the following issues have affected your training program."

exception (cost of training aids), the remainder of the findings in table 4:1 continue to support this pattern of difference between non-training and training firms. With respect to all other financial/structural aspects of training programs referred to in the table, firms without training are more likely to perceive a deterrent effect than firms with training are to perceive a problem. It is noteworthy that non-training firms tend to be the smaller firms in the sample, and we might conjecture that the overhead costs would indeed be more onerous.

The findings reported in the table suggest that firms that are involved in training go through a learning process which not only serves to reduce concern over various potential deterrents or barriers to training but also tends to make clear certain potential benefits of training, such as return on investment.

Expectations and Relations with Government

We undertook in the interviews to gather information on how the representatives of different firms viewed the division of responsibility for training between their firm and government (at any level). In particular, we were interested in exploring patterns of difference between firms with training and firms without training in this connection. The relevant findings are reported in table 4:2.

This table identifies a number of areas of responsibility with respect to training and tabulates results for non-training and training firms in terms of three categories of response: those items that are perceived as being entirely the responsibility of the firm, those items perceived as being the responsibility of both the firm and government, and those items that are perceived as being entirely the responsibility of government. As may be seen from the average percentages which are computed at the bottom of the table, training firms are, in overall terms, more likely than non-training firms to view the various aspects of training as being the responsibility of the firm. We now proceed to examine the various specific areas of responsibility in greater detail.

Both training firms and non-training firms are more likely to see the selection of trainers as the responsibility of the firm rather than of government; however, training firms are more likely (93%) to take this position than non-training firms (79%). With respect to the selection of skills to be taught and the provision of equipment and tools, there is little difference between training and non-training firms: 79% of non-

TABLE 4:2/"How Should Government (any level) and This Organization Divide Responsibility for Training?"

Area of responsibility	Non-training firms				Training firms			
	Resp. of firm %	Resp. of both %	Resp. of govt. %	(N)	Resp. of firm %	Resp. of both %	Resp. of govt. %	(N)
Selection of trainers	79	16	5	(19)	93	7	-	(29)
Selection of skills to be taught	79	16	5	(19)	77	17	6	(30)
Providing equipment, tools, etc.	63	32	5	(19)	62	28	10	(29)
Selection of trainees	52	37	11	(19)	83	14	3	(30)
Paying administrative costs	52	37	11	(19)	76	14	10	(29)
Setting quality/achievement standards for the training program	52	32	16	(19)	50	47	3	(30)
Selection of theory to be taught	47	33	20	(15)	59	31	10	(29)
Compensation of trainers	37	42	21	(19)	43	37	20	(30)
Determining length of program	32	47	21	(19)	59	38	3	(29)
Support of trainees in school	25	31	44	(16)	46	32	22	(28)
Compensation of trainees on the job	21	63	16	(19)	37	43	20	(30)
Average percentages	49	35	16		62	28	10	

training firms regard the selection of skills to be taught as a responsibility of the firm, which compares closely with the response pattern for training firms (77%). With respect to provision of equipment and tools, 63% of non-training firms view this as a responsibility of the firm; the comparable response pattern for training firms is 62%.

With respect to such responsibility areas as the selection of trainees and the paying of administrative costs related to training programs, a substantially larger proportion of training firms (83%) view the selection of trainees as a responsibility of the firm, compared to non-training firms (52%). Similarly, 76% of training firms view the paying of related administrative costs as a responsibility of the firm, compared to 52% of non-training firms.

There is little difference between the two types of firms with respect to the responsibility area of setting quality and/or achievement standards for training programs: 52% of non-training firms and 50% of training firms view this as a responsibility of the firm. There is, however, an interesting difference with respect to views on the setting of standards as being the responsibility of both the company and the government. In this connection, a larger proportion of training firms (47%) are more likely to view this area as being a joint responsibility than is the case for non-training firms (32%).

In all other areas training firms are more likely to attribute responsibility to the firm than are non-training firms. With respect to the selection of theory to be taught, 59% of training firms regard this as a responsibility of the firm, compared to 47% of non-training firms. Training firms are marginally more likely to view compensation of trainers as a responsibility of the firm (43%) compared to non-training firms (37%). The differences are more pronounced with respect to the determination of the length of the program: 59% of training firms view this as the responsibility of the firm compared to 32% of non-training firms. Similarly, 46% of training firms view the support of trainees in the school as a responsibility of the firm compared to 25% of non-training firms. Finally, 37% of training firms view compensation of trainees on the job as a responsibility of the firm, compared to 21% of non-training firms.

The findings in table 4:2 suggest that firms involved in training are generally more likely than their non-training counterparts to accept principal responsibility for a wide variety of training-related matters.

Conversely, the pattern of response for firms without training suggests a stronger propensity to look to government to assume responsibility or at least joint responsibility. These findings tentatively suggest that greater government leadership in this area is required if non-training firms are to drawn into the training process. One might question, however, if the views held in such firms with respect to the allocation of responsibility would remain the same after involvement in training was established.

Table 4:3 compares firms without training and firms with training with respect to the types of training for which government should offer greater support. A larger proportion of the firms without training take the position that there should be greater government support for both institutional training and on-the-job training. The qualitative information gathered in the course of the interviews indicates that this pattern of response is generally consistent with earlier reported findings. For some firms that do not train, the output of institutional programs represents a major means of meeting skilled manpower requirements. Other firms that do not train are interested in possibly becoming involved in employer sponsored training programs and view greater government support for on-the-job training as facilitating such involvement.

TABLE 4:3/Type of Training for Which Government Should Offer Greater Support

	Non-training firms (N=19) %	Training firms (N=30) %
Institutional training	27	20
On-the-job training	58	43
No more of either	5	17
More of both	5	17
Don't know/Doesn't matter	5	3
Totals	100	100

From our conversations with the remaining respondents, we learned that several firms with in-house training do not need assistance from government, nor do they have much demand for the kind of manpower available from institutional programs. Other firms with in-house training

programs take the position that in-house training is desirable and effective and can be further supported by stronger government initiatives, and that institutional programs should continue to be shaped to make them more compatible with industry needs.

Table 4:4 presents information on the types of evaluation of industrial skills training that government should support. As may be seen from the table, the majority of both non-training firms (79%) and training firms (68%) support proficiency testing as the most effective means of evaluation. In general, most respondents took the position that time-based evaluation does not guarantee that the trainee has learned the required skills. A larger proportion of firms with training (18%) compared to firms without training (5%) took the position that time-based evaluation was preferable. This finding reflects the experience in five training companies that proficiency testing had proven to be excessively subjective and that in the final analysis a time-based evaluation was simpler to administer and not as susceptible to judgmental error.

TABLE 4:4/Type of Evaluation for Which Government Should Offer Greater Support

	Non-training firms (N=19) %	Training firms (N=28) %
Time-based evaluation	5	18
Proficiency testing	79	68
Combination of both	16	14
Totals	100	100

Table 4:5 presents a comparison with respect to previous knowledge of government-supported programs other than apprenticeship. As may be seen from this table, by far the majority of both firms without training (89%) and firms with training (93%) were aware of the existence of such programs.

With respect to use of government-supported programs within the past five years, table 4:6 sets forth comparisons between firms currently without training and firms currently with training. As may be seen from this table, training firms are much more likely to have used apprenticeship and marginally more likely to have used other programs.

TABLE 4:5/Previous Knowledge of Government-Supported Programs for Training (other than apprenticeship)

	Non-training firms (N=19) %	Training firms (N=30) %
Yes	89	93
No	11	7
Totals	100	100

TABLE 4:6/Training and Non-Training Firms by Types of Government-Supported Training Used in Past Five Years

Type of government support	Non-training firms (currently) (N=19) %	Training firms (currently) (N=30) %
Apprenticeship	16	33
Canada Manpower Industrial Training Program	21	23
Job Experience Training	11	13
Training in Business and Industry	-	3
Other government programs	-	10
No recent government support	58	27
Totals	106*	109*

*Totals more than 100% because some firms have used more than one government program.

Table 4:7 presents responses to the question "Do you believe that employer sponsored training should or should not provide the trainee with portable skills within the industry?" As may be seen from the table, a larger proportion of firms with training (57%), compared to firms without training (44%), believe that employer sponsored training should provide the trainee with portable skills. Qualitative interview data suggest that fears lest portability of skills lead to loss of investment in training, through such factors as employee mobility or poaching, are not borne out as strongly as might be supposed by the experience of

TABLE 4:7/"Do You Believe That Employer Sponsored Training Should or Should Not Provide the Trainee with Portable Skills within the Industry?"

	Non-training firms (N=18) %	Training firms (N=28) %
Should	44	57
Should not	56	43
Totals	100	100

training firms. Still, a not insubstantial proportion of the training firms (43%) are of the opinion that programs should not lead to portable skills; in this connection, the results of the interviews suggest that this attitude is in considerable degree linked to concerns over possible loss of investment in training. Interestingly enough, a majority of respondents, whether supporting or opposing portable skills, recognize a fundamental long-term/short-term contradiction in connection with this matter. Many respondents made clear that they were well aware that the general long-term interests of both industry and employee are best served through the teaching of portable skills. A number of respondents, for example, referred to their experience that employees trained in portable skills were better motivated and better able to adapt to technological or production process change. Nonetheless, these longer-range benefits had to be carefully weighed against immediate and short-term concerns, such as ensuring that the appropriate types of specific skills are available in the company's work force in order to faciliate the uninterrupted meeting of production targets.

Table 4:8 presents the final comparison between training and non-training firms, in this case relating to perceptions of the adequacy of the current education and career guidance services in the Ontario school system. As may be seen from this table, a larger proportion of firms without training (48%) are inclined to characterize guidance services as poor as compared to 30% of firms with training. However, a larger proportion of firms with training (30%), compared with firms without training (16%), responded "don't know" to the question. In overall terms, the data presented in this table suggest that the employers interviewed do not generally have a high opinion of education and career guidance services in the Ontario school system.

TABLE 4:8/"What Would You Say about the Present Education and Career Guidance in the School System?"

	Non-training firms (N=19) %	Training firms (N=30) %
Excellent	5	3
Good	5	13
Fair	26	23
Poor	48	30
Don't know	16	30
Totals	100	100

III. TRAINING FIRMS

In this section we discuss a number of findings with reference to the 30 firms in our response sample that are currently engaged in employer sponsored training. These findings are grouped into four major categories: trainee-related issues, union-related issues, government-related issues, and issues related to educational establishments.

Before proceeding to a discussion of these various findings, there is one general finding that should be commented on at the outset. We were interested in determining the extent to which firms that are engaged in employer sponsored training believe that all other firms in their industry should in some way support employee training. The vast majority of firms engaged in training (87%) responded "yes" to the question "Do you believe that all firms in the industry should support employee training in some way?" Among the reasons offered were observations to the effect that such training in the long run benefits the entire industry and that employees who are so trained are more productive, better motivated, and better able to adapt to changing conditions. A small proportion (13%) responded "no" to the question, primarily because they believed that the decision to train or not to train was a matter that should be decided upon by the individual company. Although by and large these respondents found training to be beneficial within the context of their own firm, they were unwilling to extrapolate this experience to all firms in the industry.

Trainee-Related Issues

We were interested in learning more about the sorts of factors that affected a firm's ability to attract and keep trainees. Specifically, the following question was put to our respondents in the training firms: "To what extent have the following factors affected this organization's ability to attract trainees and to retain them as employees after completion of the training program?" Table 4:9 sets forward 13 factors which are examined in terms of whether they have (1) a somewhat or very negative effect upon a firm's ability to attract and keep trainees, (2) no effect, (3) a somewhat or very positive effect.

TABLE 4:9/Factors Perceived to Affect Firm's Ability to Attract and Keep Trainees* (responses from training firms)

	Somewhat or very negative effect %	No effect %	Somewhat or very positive effect %	(N)
Entry requirements for training and/or employment	56	41	3	(27)
Region of the firm	18	41	41	(27)
Nature of the work	18	57	25	(28)
Career expectations of workers	14	31	55	(29)
Social status as "trainee"	14	69	17	(29)
Portability of skills being learned	11	25	64	(28)
Perceived job security	11	18	71	(28)
Compensation of the trainee	9	48	43	(23)
Fees to be paid by trainee	8	58	33	(12)
Length of the training period	7	76	17	(29)
Social status as "skilled worker"	7	25	68	(28)
Distance of firm from nearest urban centre	4	58	38	(26)
Compensation of the skilled worker	4	23	73	(26)

*Question: "To what extent have the following factors affected this organization's ability to attract trainees and to retain them as employees after completion of the training program?"

As may be seen from the table, the most significant negative factor, identified by 56% of respondents, is entry requirements for training and/or employment. These difficulties relate to entry requirements set either by the firm itself or in connection with government-funded programs used by the firm. For example, a number of employers reported that referrals for the Canada Manpower Industrial Training Program often did not measure up to their minimum company requirements. In other instances, however, management might identify in their own work force a competent but relatively unskilled worker who appeared to be a good prospect for skill upgrading but whose low formal educational qualifications precluded entry to one or another available government program.

As may be seen from table 4:9, compared to entry requirements, the other factors identified in the table are far less likely to have negative effects. With respect to the positive effect of these factors, the following response pattern, in order of importance, obtains: (1) the compensation of the skilled worker (73%); (2) the perceived job security of the skilled worker (71%); (3) the social status of the skilled worker (68%); (4) the portability of skills being learned (64%). These positive attributes of the occupational status of skilled workers serve to make training programs leading to skilled employment relatively attractive.

A number of factors referred to in table 4:9 are perceived by a majority of respondents as having "no effect" on a firm's ability to attract and retain trainees. These factors include length of the training period (76%); social status as "trainee" (69%); distance of the firm from the nearest urban centre (58%); fees to be paid by the trainee (58%); and the nature of the work performed by the trainee (57%).

Table 4:10 sets forward the pattern of response to the question "How often do you have a shortage of applicants for your training program?" As may be seen from the table, the great majority of training firms (84%) responded that they rarely or never experience a shortage of applicants. This finding may be compared with other findings reported for non-training firms. Consider, for example, that 61% of firms that do not train report that they have major difficulty in attracting skilled labour. Similarly, 84% of firms that do not train responded "yes" to the question "Is there a skilled labour shortage in your industry?" It must be remembered, of course, that being able to find applicants for one's training program and producing skilled workers as a result of that training program are two different things. Nonetheless, the overall pattern of findings suggests

TABLE 4:10/"How Often Do You Have a Shortage of Applicants for Your Training Program?" (responses from training firms) (N=30)

	%
Very often	3
Occasionally	13
Rarely/Never	84
Total	100

that firms that train, as compared to those that do not train, generally experience a greater degree of control with respect to their skilled labour requirements.

Table 4:11 offers little support for the sometimes stated belief that a great problem for companies involved in training programs is that a large proportion of trainees leave before completing the program. As may be seen from the table, 27% of respondents reported that no trainees leave before training is completed, 57% that between 1 and 10% of trainees leave, and only 16% that over 11% of trainees leave. These findings suggest a rather low rate of attrition during the training process.

TABLE 4:11/Percentage of Trainees Leaving before Completion of Training (responses from training firms) (N=30)

	%
None	27
1 - 10%	57
11 - 25%	10
Over 25%	6
Total	100

Further information on the destinations of those trainees who do leave before completion of training is provided in table 4:12. As may be seen from this table, most go on to different occupations elsewhere (43%), followed by those who go on to the same occupation elsewhere (38%), those who become unemployed (14%), and those who return to school (5%).

TABLE 4:12/Destination of Trainees Who Leave before Completion of Training (responses from training firms) (N=21)

	%
Back to school	5
Different occupation	43
Same occupation elsewhere	38
Unemployment	14
Total	100

With respect to the proportion of trainees leaving within two years of completion of training (table 4:13), 50% of training firms report that between 1 and 10% of trainees leave, and 27% report that none of their trainees leave, within this time period. As is the case in table 4:11, these data indicate a relatively low rate of trainee attrition.

TABLE 4:13/Percentage of Trainees Leaving within Two Years of Completion of Training (responses from training firms) (N=30)

	%
None	27
1 - 10%	50
10 - 25%	17
Over 25%	6
Total	100

Union-Related Issues

In order to learn more about the relationships between companies and unions with respect to the provision of employer sponsored training, we put the following question to respondents in the 30 training firms: "What effect has employee representation by a union/association had on the following aspects of training in this organization?" Respondents were asked to characterize these effects in terms of "somewhat or very negative effect," "no effect," and "somewhat or very positive effect."

As may be seen from table 4:14, for six of the eight aspects of

training programs identified in the table the majority of respondents (in every case, over 70%) ascribe "no effect" to the union. These aspects of training programs include rotation of trainees during lay-off periods (84%), type of trainee evaluation (80%), accreditation of trainees (80%), compensation of trainees (79%), number of people in training at a time (75%), and length of the training program (72%).

TABLE 4:14/Effect of Union on Aspects of Training Program* (responses from training firms)

Aspects of training	Somewhat or very negative effect %	No effect %	Somewhat or very positive effect %	(N)
Selection of applicants for training	46	46	8	(13)
Ability to alter program	27	46	27	(15)
Number of people in training at a time	17	75	8	(12)
Length of the training program	14	72	14	(14)
Rotation of trainees during lay-off periods	8	84	8	(12)
Compensation of trainees	7	79	14	(14)
Type of trainee evaluation	7	80	13	(15)
Accreditation of trainees	-	80	20	(15)

*Question: "What effect has employee representation by a union/association had on the following aspects of training at this organization?"

With respect to somewhat or very negative effects, the issue of the selection of applicants for training is most frequently identified (46%). In general, selection for a company training program appears to be a frequent source of contention between management and union. It would appear that frequently their criteria for selecting trainees are fundamentally different. Further information relevant to this issue is presented in chapter 5 below in the discussion of the results of interviews with union representatives.

A more mixed picture emerges with respect to management's ability to alter a training program. Relationships with the union in this regard were characterized as having "no effect" by 46% of respondents; the rest

were divided evenly between describing the union's influence in this regard as positive and as negative (27% each). This finding and a number of other findings in the table suggest that some companies are finding their relationships with unions negative while others are finding their relationships positive.

It is our impression, gained in the course of the interviews, that there are many different degrees of accommodation between management and unions with respect to industrial training arrangements. It would seem that when management and union resolve certain fundamental issues--such as selection procedures for trainees and other forms of joint input to the design of training programs--they are then better able to work relatively harmoniously as they deal, over time, with other aspects of training programs. Further discussion of trainee selection and the role of joint apprenticeship committees is found below in chapter 5.

Government-Related Issues

We begin this section by examining the extent to which the training firms were currently using government support in connection with their programs. As may be seen from table 4:15, nearly half (47%) of the 30 firms are currently using government support. Table 4:16 further examines the relationship between companies and government with respect to training through an analysis of responses to the question "To what extent have government guidelines affected this training program?" Six aspects of the training program are identified, and company respondents were invited to indicate if government guidelines had had a somewhat or very negative effect, no effect, or a somewhat or very positive effect. As may be seen from the table, the most frequently mentioned negative effect (53%) is the amount of paperwork to be completed. With respect to the other items identified in table 4:16, more firms attribute no effect, as opposed to positive or negative effects, to government program guidelines. ("Time required for government to respond" is a tie situation, with 40% of respondents reporting "no effect" and 40% reporting "somewhat or very positive effect.")

However, it should be noted that more respondents were inclined to report a negative than positive effect with respect to the length of the program allowed under the guidelines of the government program. The duration guidelines attached to government programs were at times experienced as being too restrictive to accomplish training objectives. Positive

effects outweighed negative effects with respect to all other items: clarity of government guidelines, the time required for the relevant government agencies to respond, the firm's ability to alter the training program in consultation with government officials, and the ability of the firm to teach multi-skills.

TABLE 4:15/Use and Non-Use of Government Support Programs (responses from training firms) (N=30)

	%
Use government support	47
Don't use government support	53
Total	100

TABLE 4:16/Effect of Government Guidelines on Aspects of Training Program* (responses from firms using government support for training)

Aspect of training	Somewhat or very negative effect %	No effect %	Somewhat or very positive effect %	(N)
Amount of paperwork to be completed for government	53	33	14	(15)
Length of the program allowed by government	36	50	14	(14)
Clarity of government guidelines	20	47	33	(15)
Time required for government to respond	20	40	40	(15)
Firm's ability to alter training program	7	53	40	(15)
Ability of firm to teach multi-skills	-	71	29	(14)

*Question: "To what extent have government guidelines affected this training program in the following ways?"

Issues Related to Educational Establishments

We asked respondents in the training firms if they depended on any educational institutions for part of their training program. As may be seen

from table 4:17, 60% of the firms indicated that they did so depend; the remainder, that they did not. This matter is explored further in table 4:18, where we examine a number of matters of concern to firms related to their use of educational institutions in connection with their training programs. Respondents were asked to characterize a number of issue areas in terms of whether they represented "major or minor problems" or "no problem." As may be seen from the table, in a majority of instances no problems were encountered. However, in those instances where problems were encountered, these were most likely to involve the relevance of the skills taught in the educational institutions (33%) and the ratio of theory to practice provided (31%). Other problem areas which were less significant included the distance to the educational establishment in question (25%), the relevance of the theory taught (15%), and restrictions on class size (10%).

TABLE 4:17/"Do You Depend upon Any Educational Institutions for Part of Your Training Program?" (responses from training firms) (N=30)

	%
Yes	60
No	40
Total	100

TABLE 4:18/Issues of Concern to Firms Regarding Use of Educational Institutions in Training* (responses from training firms using educational institutions)

Issue	Major/minor problem %	No problem %	(N)
Relevance of skills taught	33	67	(12)
Ratio of theory to practice taught	31	69	(13)
Distance to school	25	75	(12)
Relevance of theory taught	15	85	(13)
Restriction on class size	10	90	(10)
Ability to teach multi-skills	9	91	(11)
Length of school course	8	92	(13)
Administrative procedures used by schools	-	100	(12)

*Question: "To what degree have the following issues created problems because of your relationship with the educational institutions?"

With respect to the problems pertaining to relevance of skills and the ratio of theory to practice, these are further discussed in the section on educational establishments in chapter 5 below.

IV. NON-TRAINING FIRMS

We now turn to an anlysis of findings obtained from the interviews carried out in the 19 companies which were not involved in employer sponsored training.

For firms not involved in training, an important question which requires examination is how they in fact meet their requirements for skilled workers. As may be seen from table 4:19, a large proportion (63%) meet their requirements by hiring workers employed by other firms. A further 26% draw upon a variety of other sources, while 11% meet their requirements for skilled workers from the education system. Given the small number of respondents in the sample of non-training firms, it is important to be cautious in generalizing these results. Nevertheless, these findings suggest that recruiting skilled workers from other firms, which in some instances may constitute poaching, is a relatively widespread activity.

TABLE 4:19/Source of Skilled Workers for Non-Training Firms (N=19)

	%
Education system	11
Other firms	63
Other sources	26
Total	100

The findings reported in table 4:20 suggest that firms that are not involved in training experience considerable difficulty in attracting skilled labour: 61% reported experiencing major difficulty, and a further 22% reported experiencing minor difficulty. In the light of these findings it is not surprising to find that 84% answered "yes" to the question "Is there a skilled labour shortage in your industry?" (table 4:21).

With respect to company/union relationships in connection with industrial training, it may be seen from table 4:22 that the majority of respondents in firms without training (67%) view unions as "not taking a

stand with respect to training." However, the remaining 33% of respondents did view unions as encouraging training. By way of further exploration of company/union relations, respondents in firms without training were asked to speculate on what conflicts with unions, if any, they envisioned if their firm were to implement a training program. The principal conflict envisioned, reported by 45% of respondents, related to seniority problems--in particular, conflict over which workers would be selected for the training program (see table 4:23). This finding is not inconsistent with the earlier discussion of relationships between training firms and unions and with findings reported below in chapter 5.

TABLE 4:20/Difficulty for Non-Training Firms in Attracting Skilled Labour (N=18)

	%
Major difficulty	61
Minor difficulty	22
No difficulty	17
Total	100

TABLE 4:21/"Is There a Skilled Labour Shortage in Your Industry?" (responses from non-training firms) (N=19)

	%
Yes	84
No	11
Don't know	5
Total	100

TABLE 4:22/Perceived Union Position on Development or Training* (in unionized non-training firms) (N=9)

	%
Encouraging training	33
Not taking a stand on training	67
Discouraging training	-
Total	100

*Question: "What has been the union/employee association stand regarding the implementation of a training program in this organization?"

TABLE 4:23/Conflict with Union Expected by Unionized Non-Training Firms* (N=9)

	%
Seniority-related conflict	45
Other union conflict	33
No conflict expected	11
Don't know	11
Total	100

*Question: "What conflicts, if any, do you foresee with the union/employee association if a training program was implemented in this organization?"

V. OTHER FINDINGS

As the preceding analysis makes clear, one of our major concerns in the present study has been to examine a number of issues related to employer sponsored training both within and across companies that train and companies that do not train. We have also inspected our data to assess the extent to which any differences with respect to various of these issues can be discerned in terms of company size, the region in which the company is located, and type of industry in which the company is involved.

It is evident, from the point of view of statistical analysis, that when one attempts to array data on 49 companies according to a number of sub-specifications such as training/non-training, size, region, and industry, extremely small numbers will soon be encountered in the cells of the tables with serious resultant problems of statistical reliability. It is for this reason that we do not believe it would be prudent to present tabular material based on such small numbers. Rather, we have inspected the results of our interviews, which comprise both quantitative and qualitative forms of data, and have identified below a number of patterns of variation which appear to be related to such factors as size, region, and industry. However, we urge that these findings be treated with appropriate caution inasmuch as the small numbers with which we are working preclude the use of rigorous statistical techniques of assessment. Despite these limitations, in our view a number of the findings discussed below appear to be plausible and, we believe, offer useful leads for further investigation. We begin with a discussion of some of the implications of company size as measured by number of employees.

The companies in which interviews were carried out ranged in size from three employees to fifteen hundred employees. (For full details, consult Appendix A.)

As pointed out earlier in chapter 3, large firms (200 or more employees) were more likely to be engaged in training than small firms: 53% of firms with fewer than 50 employees were involved in training, compared to 50% of firms with between 50 and 200 employees and 78% of firms with 200 employees or more. Among training firms our interviews suggest that larger firms are less favourably disposed toward government involvement in the training process. Respondents from larger training firms generally appear to feel that their organizations were capable of meeting their training objectives without intervention. Smaller firms appear to be more generally positively disposed toward government involvement, and in fact did make greater use of government support programs. The interview data also suggest that larger firms are more likely to develop their own in-house program, whereas smaller firms appear to make greater use of apprenticeship. Among most non-training firms, concerns over poaching and thus loss of return on investment appear to deter involvement among smaller firms more often than among larger firms.

With respect to region, as we have already seen in chapter 3, firms in the highly industrialized and densely populated central region are somewhat more likely to be involved in training than firms located elsewhere in Ontario. Specifically, 69% of firms located in the central region of Ontario are involved in training compared with 63% of firms in the southeastern region, 55% in the southwestern region, and 54% in the northern region. Among training firms there appears to be a somewhat higher rate of trainee attrition in the central region, probably a reflection of the more open and competitive labour market in that part of the province.

Finally, with respect to industry type, the interview data suggest that firms involved in sheet metal fabrication have the greatest need for skilled workers but are among the least likely to engage in training. Their reluctance appears to arise, in considerable degree, from fears of poaching. Among training firms it would appear that companies involved in such service industries as dry cleaning and laundering, hardware sales, and the hotel and motel industry experience greater difficulty in attracting trainees compared to the other industry types represented in the response sample. In part, this difficulty appears to arise from the per-

ception among potential trainees that employment in these industries offers low status.

5 Training: The Views of Other Constituencies

I. INTRODUCTION

As stated earlier the principal data base for this study of barriers to and incentives for employer sponsored training was the information obtained through the interviews carried out in 49 companies. However, in order to obtain preliminary information on the larger context of employer sponsored training, it was decided, in consultation with senior officials of the Industrial Training Council, to carry out at least some interviews in educational establishments, employer associations, government agencies, and trade unions. In all, 21 such interviews were carried out. Given the relatively large number of constituencies involved and the rather small number of interviews, it is evident that findings reported in this chapter need to be regarded as preliminary information. Nonetheless, these additional interviews have yielded some interesting and valuable results and will be useful in helping to specify the types of further information that should be obtained from the various constituencies having an interest in employer sponsored training.

As may be seen from table 5:1, of the 21 interviews ten were carried out in educational establishments, six in employer associations, two in government agencies, and three in unions. In each case the findings arising from the interviews will be organized in terms of barriers to employer sponsored training, incentives or facilitating conditions for employer sponsored training, and proposals for government action.

It should be noted that the views reported here are those of the individuals interviewed and that there may be different or additional views on these issues in any given constituency. It is our opinion that the findings reported in this chapter do provide useful preliminary information on some concerns related to employer sponsored training found

Table 5:1/Distribution of Interviews Carried Out in Other Constituencies

Type of organization	Number interviewed
Educational establishments (including community colleges, boards of education, and private trade schools)	10
Employer associations	6
Government agencies	2
Unions	3
Total	21

in constituencies other than the companies in which interviews were conducted. It should also be noted that in their discussions of barriers, incentives, and proposals for action, these 21 respondents did not limit their observations to their own constituency or sector.

With respect to the various barriers to and incentives or facilitating conditions for employer sponsored training which are set forward below by constituency, we have presented these in the order of most important to least important. This ordering process was carried out on the basis of quantitative and qualitative information gathered in the course of the interviews and inevitably involves a judgmental component.

With respect to the proposals for government action discussed below, we found that many respondents did not make an active distinction between federal and provincial levels of government in their comments. This was also observed to occur in a number of the references to government that arose in connection with the exploration of barriers and incentives. Where a particular level of government was explicitly identified by a respondent, the discussion below reflects this. Finally, it was not possible to rank order the proposals for government action.

We turn now to a discussion of the findings.

II. EDUCATIONAL ESTABLISHMENTS

The following findings are based on interviews carried out in a total of ten educational establishments: four community colleges representing the four geographical areas of Ontario; four boards of education representing the four geographical areas of Ontario; and two private trade schools.

The barriers to employer sponsored training identified by these respondents are set forward below in order of importance, as are the

incentives or facilitating conditions identified. Also set forward below are a number of recommendations for government action emanating from these respondents.

Barriers

1. Respondents representing educational establishments reported that the inflexible and ambiguous nature of many government programs and guidelines inhibits the acceptance and effective implementation of government-supported training programs in industry. With respect to inflexibility, the respondents had in mind that program guidelines were generally so constructed that it was not possible to shape programs to a firm's specific needs. With respect to ambiguity, it was felt that at least some government program guidelines were subject to considerable interpretation by government officials and that such interpretation was not consistent over time.

2. Respondents suggested that there was less than satisfactory communication and coordination between the relevant departments of government and the users of government-subsidized training programs, such as firms and the community colleges. Concern was also voiced over what appeared to be inconsistent responses and interpretations emanating from government officials with respect to such programs. Respondents felt that such problems of communication, coordination, and interpretation impaired the usefulness of such programs and, indeed, in some instances deterred potential users from taking advantage of them.

3. The amount of paper burden associated with government-supported training programs inhibits the willingness of potential users to participate in them.

4. Representatives of schools and colleges alike reported equipment-related difficulties that mitigate against providing instruction in various skills. This difficulty assumes two principal forms. First, given the high cost of much industrial equipment, it is often infeasible for the school board or college to make the required capital investment. Second, the heavy utilization of existing equipment for instructional purposes frequently leads to a situation where the equipment is in poor condition and/or subject to frequent breakdown.

5. Many potential trainees are effectively barred from obtaining training in the community college setting because they lack minimum educational entrance requirements. Respondents from community colleges

in particular suggested that entrance requirements inhibited full and effective use of the colleges in the provision of employer sponsored training.

6. Disagreements or at least differences in priorities arise between college staff and employers that serve to inhibit their cooperation. In general, a number of employers feel that programs in the colleges and schools place too much emphasis on theory and too little on practice. Differences of opinion also arise around the issue of equipment acquisitions. There is a feeling that when new equipment is to be acquired, college staff prefer the most recent or technologically sophisticated types of equipment. In fact, many employers may prefer that the trainees be exposed to existing, more conventional types of equipment, as it is this type of equipment with which they will have to work after completing their training.

7. There is a feeling that the large and growing number of government-subsidized programs for industrial training has created conditions of confusion and "information overload" which unnecessarily complicate the delivery system for such programs and, in some instances, actively deter potential users from participating in them.

8. The already high and escalating cost of materials places restrictions upon the extent to which "hands-on" training is used in educational establishments.

Incentives or Facilitating Conditions

1. Contrary to much currently held opinion, several of the respondents in the educational establishments were of the opinion that a relatively large number of students are interested in pursuing industrial training, particularly in those industries characterized by higher prestige, hence providing employers with an adequate supply of training applicants.

2. Respondents referred to the occasional practice of companies' providing access to their machinery or equipment during "down-time" so that trainees and students might have more adequate opportunities for "hands-on" skills training. It should not be inferred that a large number of companies are engaged in this practice; however, some of our respondents expressed the opinion that there was potential for further development of this type of cooperation between industry and educational establishments. It would appear that industry is most receptive to this type of proposal when trainee shortages are being experienced.

3. The participation of employers on community college advisory boards provides an opportunity for more effective communication and for the development of cooperative approaches. Our college respondents felt that this represented an important area in which further development could take place.

4. The move toward more modular forms of training was perceived as facilitating more effective coordination between institutional and on-the-job training. The use of training modules allows a more specific identification of how far the trainee has proceeded in skills acquisition. A modular approach to training allows freer movement of the trainee between the college and the employment setting.

5. For those employers who have a particular need for employees with multiple skills, the capacity of some college programs to provide multi-skills training or "cross-crafting" is particularly attractive.

Proposals for Government Action

1. In general, there should be greater integration among the various types of government-subsidized training programs instead of a multiplicity of different programs. It would be most desirable if a general system of government financial and advisory aid could be developed with respect to industrial training. Such a system should allow flexibility to meet the needs of different industries and different types of firms and should be staffed, coordinated, and presented by professional training consultants.

2. There should be more active and focussed publicity to make the general public more aware of the need for and benefits of training skilled workers.

3. Efforts should be made to explore the feasibility of introducing technical studies earlier in the school curriculum than is presently the case.

4. Career guidance staff in the schools should be encouraged to develop closer liaison with industry and to expose their student clients to more presentations by representatives of industry.

5. Career counselling should not take place only in the school environment. Alternative institutional arrangements for the provision of counselling services should be explored, including the "store-front" approach.

6. Information on the supply and demand situation in various occupations, particularly the skilled trades, should be publicized

and communicated in a far more direct and understandable way.

7. The provincial government should take action to delineate more clearly the specific responsibilities of different levels of the education system with respect to industrial training.

III. EMPLOYER ASSOCIATIONS

Interviews were carried out in six employer associations. These associations represented the machinery and equipment manufacturing industry, the chemical producing industry, the industrial instrument manufacturing sector, the retail hardware industry, dry cleaners and launderers, and the hotel and motel industry. The various barriers to and incentives and facilitating conditions for employer sponsored training identified by these respondents are set forward below. In addition, we also set forward their proposals for government action.

Barriers

1. A number of respondents representing the employer association sector suggested that there is at present a serious shortage of skilled workers to act as trainers. In particular, serious problems are encountered when an effort is made to locate an individual who not only has the requisite skills but has the ability to communicate them to others in a training setting. This shortage of skilled trainers also tends to exert serious upward pressure on the costs of such training.

2. Serious difficulties are encountered in attempting to attract a sufficient number of trainees in industries that are apparently considered by many potential trainees as of generally low status. In general, it would appear that service industries are most likely to be affected in this regard. Our respondents who represented the dry cleaning and laundering sector, hardware sales, and the hotel industry were particularly concerned about this issue.

3. The multiplicity of different production methods used in certain industries (for example, the petroleum and chemical industry) mitigates against the development of general training programs through the employer associations.

4. The training implications of this multiplicity of production processes are further complicated in that the production processes are frequently subject to considerable secrecy so that a company may establish or maintain competitive advantage. These circumstances limit

the role that the employer associations might play in training programs.

5. Employer associations have limited financial and staff resources and many different priorities to serve other than the promotion or development of employer sponsored training. A number of respondents representing employer associations felt that without more adequate financial support their associations could play only a limited role in the area.

Incentives or Facilitating Conditions

1. Shortages of skilled labour are becoming increasingly apparent in a number of industries, and this circumstance is generally serving as a positive reinforcement for more serious thinking about the initiation of employer sponsored training arrangements. In short, the present setting is relatively conducive to development of such training, although serious obstacles still prevail in the form of a perceived lack of leadership for the purpose and the persistent problems of inadequate financial and/or staff resources.

2. Representatives of employer associations feel that their associations are well placed to play both a developmental and facilitating role with respect to employer sponsored training. For example, they are generally knowledgeable about the most appropriate people to contact in each industry. They are also reasonably well placed to contribute to the communication process between specific companies and other key actors in training arrangements, such as the community colleges.

Proposals for Government Action

1. Government should provide more financial support for skills training and, in particular, on-the-job training.

2. The provincial government should assess the potential for wider application of innovations such as the Ontario Hostelry Institute as a means of meeting the training requirements of other service industries. In addition, government should show more awareness of the training needs of the retail industries.

3. Information about government programs and the guidelines governing such programs could be considerably simplified and presented in a more straightforward manner that would more readily enlist the interest and cooperation of industry.

4. In general, government should take a leadership role in

emphasizing the importance of trainees' being provided with portable skills. In this connection, it will be noted that in our earlier-reported findings (table 4:7) almost half of training firms and more than half of non-training firms were opposed to the teaching of portable skills. It is our impression that representatives of the employer associations are further removed from the front-line manpower supply problems that many managers face daily and are therefore somewhat more likely to perceive and emphasize the benefit side of portable skills training.

5. The provincial government should take initiatives to improve the standardization of training courses offered in various parts of the Ontario education system.

IV. GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Two interviews were carried out in branches of an agency of the Ontario government that is concerned with industrial training. One branch represented the southwestern region of the province, the other the southeastern region. The barriers to and incentives or facilitating conditions for employer sponsored training identified in the course of these interviews are set forward below. In addition, a number of proposals for government action are also identified.

Barriers

1. There is a lack of flexibility in the guidelines for many government subsidized training programs that inhibits use of these programs by many employers. In particular, it is difficult to shape programs to the specific needs of different types of industrial and/or business operations.

2. The absence of a detailed cost/benefit analysis of government subsidies to industrial training is preventing the identification of more effective ways and means of applying such funds and, in particular, developing more effective ways and means of promoting the use of employer sponsored training.

3. The widespread development of a modular approach to industrial training has been impeded by negative attitudes emanating from the unions and attitudes of uncertainty emanating from many employers.

4. Many companies are extremely concerned about the problem of poaching and for this reason are most reluctant to engage in schemes that emphasize the training of portable skills.

5. The paper burden associated with government programs tends to inhibit participation by a number of potential users.

Incentives or Facilitating Conditions

1. In any given industry, as the proportion of companies offering training programs increases, non-training firms become less reluctant to train and, in particular, train portable skills as fears of poaching are not borne out.

Proposals for Government Action

1. Government should engage in closer scrutiny and detailed audit of the use of funds for industrial training with the end in view of determining the most appropriate and effective way of targeting those funds.

2. Mechanisms need to be devised to provide a measure of protection to firms so that they will become less concerned about poaching and more likely to engage in industrial training. Such mechanisms are particularly needed to protect and encourage smaller companies.

3. It is important that government and the private sector actively cooperate on a wide range of training-related issues including sharing the financial burden of training, selecting trainees and skill areas, and setting the length of training programs. There is a considerable need for the development of policy and programming that will facilitate and specify such cooperative effort.

4. The schedules for apprenticeship training are in many instances seriously out of date. They should be abandoned or extensively changed.

5. Compulsory certification should be replaced with a modular system of training in order to avoid the overlap of training content that frequently characterizes the apprenticeship system.

6. The applications and benefits of modular training need to be far more adequately publicized through the media to employers. In addition, more direct and concerted approaches should be made to technical directors in the education system with respect to the benefits and applications of modular training.

V. UNIONS

Interviews were carried out in three unions representing workers in the automobile and aerospace industry, the electrical, radio, and machinery

industry, and the steel industry. The various barriers to and incentives and facilitating conditions for employer sponsored training identified in these interviews are set forward below. In addition, we present the proposals for government action that were discussed by respondents in the course of the interviews.

Barriers

1. The most frequently mentioned barrier to effective cooperation between employers and unions with respect to employer sponsored training was disagreement over the selection of trainees. Management may in principle be favourably disposed toward the implementation of an in-house training program but, in the view of our union respondents, will often attach conditions to the selection of trainees which the union finds unacceptable, particularly where seniority prerogatives are infringed.

2. The negotiation of lay-off arrangements between management and union representatives presents another area of labour-management conflict that can impede the effective development of training programs. In many unionized plants, lay-offs occur on a ratio basis. For example, if the ratio of trainee to non-trainee workers is 1 to 8, then one trainee will be laid off for every eight skilled workers so that the ratio will remain intact. In some instances, management would prefer to retain a larger proportion of more skilled and hence generally more efficient and productive workers. In other instances, management would prefer that a larger proportion of skilled workers be laid off in order to reduce the wage bill. Union concerns that the seniority principle be observed further complicate the development of acceptable lay-off procedures. Negotiating acceptable lay-off procedures which also make reasonable provision for trainees is thus a complicated process, the relative success or failure of which has obvious implications for the development of effective employer sponsored training arrangements.

3. Conflict also arises between unions and management with respect to the amount of input union representatives wish to have with respect to the design and development of training programs. This conflict becomes particularly salient over the issue of joint apprenticeship committees. Exhibit 5:1 compares the duties of joint apprenticeship committees in two of the three unions in which interviews were conducted. The joint apprenticeship committee is obviously a most important entity, from the

Exhibit 5:1/ Comparison of Duties of Joint Apprenticeship Committees in Two Union Clauses

UNION A	UNION B
To screen and select qualified applicants for apprenticeship and to refer such applicants to management for placement.	To see that each prospective apprentice is interviewed and impressed with the responsibilities he is about to accept, as well as the benefits he will receive. This will allow the Committee to designate whom they choose as interviewers, not necessarily Committee members. To accept or reject applicants for apprenticeship after preliminary examination by the Personnel Department of the Company.
To place apprentices under written apprenticeship agreement. To approve apprenticeship agreements between the apprentice and employer and to submit these agreements to the appropriate registration agency for registration. To notify the registration agency of all terminations and cancellations of apprenticeship agreements.	To place apprentices under agreement.
To establish minimum standards of related instruction and on-the-job training required of apprentices, and to see that these are adhered to both on the job and in the classroom. To be responsible for the successful operation of these standards by performing the duties herein listed.	In general, to be responsible for the successful operation of the apprenticeship standards in the plant and the successful completion of the apprenticeship by the apprentices under these standards.
To arrange methods for determining the apprentice's progress in manipulative skills and technical knowledge.	To offer constructive suggestions for improvement of training on the job.
To hear and adjust all complaints of violations of apprenticeship agreements. The apprentice may consult with the Committee or the registration agency at any time for an interpretation of any	To hear and decide on all questions involving the apprentices which relate to their apprenticeship.

UNION A	UNION B
provision of these standards over which differences may occur. This provision shall be subject to the basic labor agreement.	
To notify the registration agency when apprentices have satisfactorily completed their apprenticeship and to request the issuance of a certificate of completion to such apprentices.	To certify the names of graduate apprentices. No certificates will be issued unless approved by the Committee.
To visit the school where related training classes are held frequently each semester.	To work out with the local Board of Education the form, content and schedule of the course or courses of instruction to be provided. The Committee will also cooperate with the school authorities in coordinating the related classroom instruction with the apprentice's basic schedule of work experience.
To make an annual report covering the work of the Joint Apprenticeship Committee.	The Company will see to it that the minutes of Committee meetings will be furnished to and approved by the Joint Apprenticeship Committee.
To maintain a record of each apprentice's training progress on the job and in related instruction.	--
To provide for continuous employment of apprentices insofar as possible.	--

point of view of the unions interviewed, with respect to how industrial training programs are formulated and developed. Our union respondents indicated that the joint apprenticeship committee is not a matter over which many unions are prepared to compromise. On the other hand, management sensitivities arise from the feeling that management decision-making prerogatives would be intruded upon if the union's proposed joint apprenticeship committees are established.

4. Conflict arises between unions and management with respect to the forms of industrial training to be used. In the view of our union

respondents, the managements of a number of companies prefer modular training and multi-skill training because it fits well with their requirements for manpower flexibility. From the point of view of many union representatives, these particular approaches to industrial training threaten to result in the fragmentation of established trades.

5. The existence of minimum educational requirements, particularly in the community college programs, operates as a barrier to some union members' upgrading their qualifications.

Incentives and Facilitating Conditions

1. Our respondents suggest that in general unions have a relatively positive attitude toward employer sponsored training and are prepared to engage actively in the negotiation of such arrangements.

2. Our respondents suggest that the higher wages, better job security, superior employment opportunities, and hence resulting higher status of skilled workers all serve as positive incentives for young people to learn skills through employer sponsored training.

Proposals for Government Action

1. Government should act upon the recommendations contained in the "Statement on Manpower Policy" issued by the Ontario Federation of Labour at its 22nd annual convention, 13-16 November 1978. In particular, government should act on the implementation of a levy/grant system as per recommendation #5 of that document:

> We believe that this country must finally accept the principle that manpower training is essential to the development of efficient industrial activity. Therefore we recommend that all training costs, including development, administration and labour costs, be shared by all industries in a given area of activity in proportion to their size and utilization of training. In order to ensure the achievement of this objective we recommend the establishment of joint boards, composed of labour, industry and government, to establish policies for each training area, to collect funds from employers, to evaluate training programmes for which funds are requested and to generally administrate joint board activity.

2. Employers should be required to teach portable skills as part of their training of employees.

3. Active effort should be taken to publicize the existence and availability of employer sponsored training as an alternative to other forms of manpower development.

6 Conclusions

I. INTRODUCTION

We now set forward the principal conclusions arising from the interviews carried out with 49 companies and 21 other organizations representing constituencies having an interest in employer sponsored training. We begin by presenting the principal findings and associated conclusions related to the company sector and employer sponsored training. This is followed by principal findings and related conclusions for the other constituencies surveyed. Finally, we briefly discuss selected general overall themes arising from this field survey component of the larger study of barriers to employer sponsored training.

II. THE COMPANY SECTOR AND EMPLOYER SPONSORED TRAINING

In this section we examine the principal findings and related conclusions arising from the interviews carried out with 49 companies; 30 of the companies were involved in employer sponsored training and the remaining 19 were not.

Basic Profile Information

About half of the companies in which interviews were conducted were unionized.

Ten percent of the companies in which interviews were conducted made use of only apprenticeship training. A further 10% made use of both apprenticeship and in-housing training, while 41% made use of in-house training exclusively. The remaining 39% were not involved in training.

We found that firms located in the highly industrialized and densely populated central part of Ontario were most likely to train (69%)

followed by firms in the southeastern part of the province (67%), the southwestern part of the province (65%), and the northern part of the province (54%). We found that larger firms with more than 200 employees were more likely to train (78%) than firms with between 50 and 200 employees (50%) or firms with fewer than 50 employees (53%).

Training and Non-Training Firms Compared

We found that training firms were less likely than non-training firms to view a number of different financial and/or structural aspects of training programs as impediments to becoming involved in such training. For example, 71% of non-training firms indicated that concern over return on investment in training had to at least some degree a deterrent effect. By way of contrast, only 14% of training firms expressed the view that concerns over return on investment in training had a negative effect with respect to the decision to become involved in training. In fact, 69% of training firms viewed return on investment as a positive aspect of involvement in training. Our findings strongly suggest that firms actually involved in training are rather less concerned about a variety of financial and organizational aspects of training programs compared to their non-training counterparts.

With respect to sharing responsibility for training with government, training firms show a considerably greater degree of reluctance to engage in this type of arrangement than their non-training counterparts. Our interview data suggest that training firms are generally confident about their ability to meet their training objectives in an autonomous fashion and are less likely to seek or welcome government intervention.

Both training firms and non-training firms are more likely to support proficiency testing as opposed to time-based testing. However, firms with training are more than three times as likely to support time-based evaluation methods.

More of the training firms (57%) than of the non-training firms (44%) support the proposition that employer sponsored training should provide the trainee with portable skills. Concerns over loss of investment because of trainee mobility or poaching are often thought to mitigate against employers' willingness to train portable skills. In fact, our interview data suggest that these problems of poaching and mobility are somewhat less serious than is sometimes supposed.

Finally, with respect to the perceived quality of education and career guidance services in the Ontario schools, it would appear that both training firms and non-training firms generally express the view that these services are less than totally satisfactory.

Training Firms

Most training firms (87%) take the view that all other firms in their industry sector should support employee training in some way. The relatively small proportion not supporting this view by and large take a "laissez-faire" position: that is, in their view this matter should be left up to the discretion of the individual firm.

With respect to a firm's ability to attract and keep trainees, the entry requirements for training and/or employment emerge as the major obstacle (56%). These include minimum requirements established by the firms themselves, those attached to government-supported programs, and those set by educational establishments. Cited as positive forces in the attraction and retention of trainees are a number of aspects of the conditions of skilled work. These include the relative security, better than average compensation, and higher social status enjoyed by skilled workers. This perspective is reinforced by the observation made by 84% of respondents in training firms to the effect that they rarely or never experience shortages of applicants for their training programs.

It is sometimes suggested that one of the reasons for firms' reluctance to become involved in employer sponsored training is the high rates of attrition among trainees. The data resulting from our interviews do little to support this contention. We find, in fact, that 84% of training firms report that 10% or fewer of their trainees leave before the completion of training. Similarly, 77% of training firms report that 10% or fewer of their trainees leave within two years of completing training.

The majority of our respondent firms expressed the opinion that unions have no effect upon their training programs. However, insofar as negative effects were reported, these were most likely to involve problems with respect to the selection of trainees and, more generally, problems revolving around the joint working out of the form and content of such training programs. It appears that in those instances where management and union representatives are able to reach accommodation with respect to such basic issues as the selection of trainees, then other aspects or

issues arising in connection with a given training program are more likely to be amicably resolved.

With respect to those firms engaged in training, 47% currently make use of some form of government support. The greatest single problem experienced by firms using government support (53%) is the significant amount of paperwork associated with participation in government programs. More generally, concerns are also voiced over the complexity and inflexibility of the guidelines attached to such programs and inconsistency or variability in the interpretation of guidelines by the relevant government officials.

Finally, 60% of the training firms use educational institutions in connection with part of their program. This use of educational institutions, however, is not without problems. In particular, concerns were voiced among our respondents over the relevance of the skills taught and the appropriateness of the ratio of theory to practice presented.

Non-Training Firms

Among the non-training firms, 63% indicate that they meet their skilled manpower requirements by hiring workers from other firms. In some instances, this clearly constitutes poaching activity. A majority (61%) of non-training firms report that they experience major difficulty in attracting skilled workers; and, not surprisingly, 84% reported skilled labour shortages in their industry. In general, our findings suggest that training firms have a greater degree of control over their skilled labour supply and in general perceive training as an effective strategy for meeting their manpower requirements. In the case of firms that do not train, these apparent benefits appear outweighed by perceptions of significant risks, such as loss of return on investment in training.

Other Comments

In general, our data suggest that large firms are more likely to train than small firms and that small firms are more likely to be concerned about the financial risks attached to training. It would also appear that smaller firms are more apt to look to government for incentives to become involved in training. With respect to trainee attrition, it would appear that this is a greater problem in the highly industrialized and densely populated central region of Ontario than in other parts of the province. However, this finding is not surprising given the more open

and competitive labour market conditions that characterize that part of the province. With respect to industry type, it appears that the service industries represented in our sample experience more difficulty than the higher-technology industries in attracting trainees. This finding suggests that specific government initiatives, such as the Ontario Hostelry Institute, may be required in order to create more favourable recruitment and training conditions for such industries.

Finally, in this connection, it emerged in our interviews that those firms engaged in metal fabrication have the greatest need for skilled workers but are among the most reluctant to engage in training, largely because of a fear of poaching. One of our respondents made the point that as training increased, poaching generally declined. This observation would appear to be borne out by the general tenor of our findings with respect to training firms. It would appear that some specifically focussed government initiatives would be desirable to promote and support industrial training in the metal fabricating industry sector, at least until a sufficient critical mass of skilled manpower has been established to reduce what is evidently a not inconsiderable poaching problem.

We must caution that the above comments with respect to size, region, and industry type are based upon very small numbers and that a more definitive assessment of these indicated patterns would require carrying out additional interviews with a number of companies.

III. OTHER CONSTITUENCIES AND EMPLOYER SPONSORED TRAINING

We now discuss the principal findings and conclusions arising from interviews conducted in 21 organizations representing constituencies having an interest in employer sponsored training. These organizations included ten educational establishments, six employer associations, two government agencies, and three unions. The discussion is organized in terms of barriers to employer sponsored training, incentives or facilitating conditions, and proposals for government action.

Barriers

Several barriers to wider adoption of employer sponsored training were identified in the course of the interviews carried out in a number of educational establishments. These barriers included the restrictive or limiting effect of the guidelines attached to many government-supported programs for industrial training and lack of clarity or inconsistency

in the communication and interpretation of many of these guidelines. Respondents from the education sector also voiced concern over financial barriers to acquiring the most appropriate type of equipment or machinery for the training of certain skills. Entrance requirements, particularly in the community colleges, were also perceived as a barrier to many potential trainees. Differences of opinion appear to exist between educators and employers regarding the relevance of some industrial training programs in the education sector and the mix of theory and practice available in various of these courses and programs. Concern was also voiced over the proliferation of programs related to industrial training and the impediment to hands-on training that the high cost of materials presents.

Representatives of the employer associations in which interviews were conducted expressed concern over a shortage of competent trainers and the upward pressure this shortage caused with respect to training costs. Concern was also voiced over the difficulty of attracting trainees in various industries, typically service industries, which are perceived by some as being of relatively low status. The multiplicity, and at times secrecy, of production techniques in various industries was also identified as an obstacle to the effective involvement of employer associations. In general, the representatives of the employer associations indicated a generally positive posture with respect to employer sponsored training but felt that financial and staff limitations mitigated against their playing a larger role.

With respect to the interviews carried out in government agencies, respondents here also identified the problem of complex and inflexible guidelines attached to many government-supported programs for industrial training. These respondents also alluded to the barrier effect of the heavy paper burden that is often associated with such programs. The view was also expressed that a more detailed cost/benefit analysis of existing industrial training programs would be helpful in arriving at a more adequate framework for the allocation of presently available resources. Other barriers that were alluded to in the course of these interviews included negative reactions from some unions with respect to modular training and the concerns over poaching that affect both training and non-training firms.

In the course of the interviews carried out with union representatives, the most frequently mentioned barrier to a more widespread

adoption of employer sponsored training schemes related to the mechanisms for the selection of trainees. In discussions with both company and union representatives it becomes clear that company and union criteria for the selection of trainees are often most difficult to reconcile.

Respondents also identified negotiation of ratio lay-off arrangements and negotiations related to joint apprenticeship committees as major problem areas that not infrequently impede the development of training schemes. Union respondents also indicated that disagreements arise over the forms of employer sponsored training to be used. It is evident in some instances that companies prefer to train workers in particular subcomponents of a given skill area. This practice gives rise to considerable concern in union circles over the fragmentation of trades. Finally, respondents further indicated that entrance requirements, both those developed by companies for their programs and those developed by educational establishments for their programs, often operate as barriers to potential trainees seeking to upgrade their skills.

Incentives or Facilitating Conditions

The following emerged as some of the more important incentives or conditions facilitating greater use of employer sponsored training. Respondents in both the education and union sectors advanced the view that employment as a skilled worker was becoming relatively more attractive nowadays and that, in general, this had a favourable impact upon the availability of potential trainees.

A number of the representatives of employer associations took a comparable view, only this view was more likely to be expressed from the demand side. Specifically, the opinion was voiced that present shortages in many skilled trades, and prospects of a worsening situation in the future, had created a greater sense of urgency with respect to the issue of industrial training and that this greater urgency was conducive to more active initiatives to promote more effective and widespread approaches to industrial training.

Although respondents from all sectors espoused a positive and cooperative attitude with respect to employer sponsored training, it was rather surprising to note the relative paucity of specific policy, program, or other institutional arrangements that were proposed as effective, concrete mechanisms for fostering such training.

Proposals for Government Action

Respondents from both the education sector and the employer associations emphasized the importance of moving toward a more systematic form of organization for government programs designed to support industrial training. In particular, the opinion was voiced that efforts should be made to simplify the guidelines governing such programs and, in general, introduce elements of flexibility that would allow the easier adaptation of such programs to different circumstances. Community college respondents in particular recommended the greater use of professional government training advisers in an effort to develop a more effective interface between the providers and users of such programs.

Recommendations also emanated from respondents in the education sector and the unions to the effect that more explicit and active efforts should be made to publicize and promote employer sponsored training, particularly as an alternative to other forms of skills training.

Respondents in both the unions and the employer associations emphasized the importance of teaching portable skills, and respondents from the government sector underscored the significance of modular training as a more effective approach to skills training.

Proposals which have implications for the education system included efforts to improve the quality of educational and career guidance and the earlier introduction of technical studies into the curriculum.

IV. FINAL COMMENTS

We now conclude by identifying and discussing some of the most general and pervasive themes that have emerged in connection with this study of barriers to employer sponsored training.

It would seem clear that those firms that are involved in employer sponsored training have, compared to firms that do not train, a more positive view of the benefits arising from such training and fewer concerns related to possible risks. In particular, our data suggest that training firms regard training as a good investment and are less likely than non-training firms to express concern over such matters as poaching and trainee attrition. The findings incline one to infer cautiously that if more firms could be attracted to undertake employer sponsored training on an experimental or conditional basis, a not insignificant number of these firms would become persuaded of its merits and adopt it on a continuing basis.

These findings suggest that there is a role for government leadership in assisting non-training firms and, in particular, smaller firms to overcome various obstacles, both real and perceived, to participation. There is a need, however, that such government initiatives and programs be conceived along more flexible lines in order to cope more adequately with the different types of industrial training that are associated with such factors as company size, region of the province, and type of industry. We have seen, in particular, that smaller firms are more concerned than larger firms about the possible financial risks of becoming involved in employer sponsored training and are more prepared to look toward and entertain direct government involvement and assistance. The success of government initiatives is likely to be greater if the program vehicles used are characterized by simplicity and flexibility in the governing guidelines and minimum paper burden.

It would appear that our changing economic environment is making skilled work a more attractive alternative both to the present labour force and to young people preparing for labour force entry. It is also evident, however, that our highly institutionalized system of industrial training has created numerous rigidities and inflexibilities which are well typified by the frequently inhibiting effects of entrance requirements, whether these entrance requirements are developed by employers or educational establishments or attached to government programs.

The next task is to assess the program design and policy development implications of various of the findings reported here with respect to the possible modification of existing arrangements and, perhaps more important, the development of new or alternative policy and program initiatives. Information yielded by this field survey component of the study of barriers to employer sponsored training has provided a starting point for such an exercise.

Appendix A: Selected Characteristics of Organizations in Which Interviews Were Carried Out

EXHIBIT A:1

Selected Characteristics of Companies in Which Interviews Were Conducted

Industry Type	Nearest Community	Number of Employees in Plant	Union Status	Type of Training
Chemical/Petroleum	London	101	Union	In-House
Hotel	Toronto	500	Union	Apprenticeship, In-House
Hardware	Toronto	250	Union	In-House
Hotel	Toronto	1500	Union	In-House
Hardware	Toronto	1000	Non-Union	In-House
Machining	Kingston	40	Non-Union	Apprenticeship
Hardware	Ottawa	52	Non-Union	In-House
Chemical/Petroleum	North Bay	35	Non-Union	In-House
Hardware	Sudbury	25	Union	In-House
Chemical/Petroleum	North Bay	276	Union	In-House
Chemical/Petroleum	Kingston	800	Union	Apprenticeship, In-House
Sheetmetal Fabricator	Toronto	250	Union	In-House
Precision Instruments	Toronto	1412	Non-Union	Apprenticeship, In-House
Hotel	Sudbury	140	Non-Union	In-House
Sheetmetal Fabricator	Windsor	8	Union	Apprenticeship
Hotel	Ottawa	550	Union	In-House
Machining	Toronto	65	Non-Union	Apprenticeship, In-House
Machining	Windsor	190	Union	Apprenticeship

Industry Type	Nearest Community	Number of Employees in Plant	Union Status	Type of Training
Machining	Brockville	15	Non-Union	In-House
Machining	Brampton	25	Non-Union	Apprenticeship
Hardware	London	300	Non-Union	In-House
Dry Cleaners	London	6	Non-Union	In-House
Chemical/Petroleum	Belleville	150	Union	Apprenticeship, In-House
Machining	Brockville	1000	Non-Union	In-House
Precision Instruments	Toronto	300	Non-Union	In-House
Precision Instruments	Ottawa	650	Union	In-House
Chemical/ Petroleum	Sarnia	1500	Union	In-House
Machining	Orillia	26	Non-Union	Apprenticeship
Chemical/Petroleum	Gravenhurst	22	Non-Union	In-House
Machining	Bracebridge	82	Union	In-House
Dry Cleaners	Kingston	55	Non-Union	None
Machining	Woodstock	204	Union	None
Sheetmetal Fabricator	London	272	Union	None
Sheetmetal Fabricator	Brockville	154	Union	None
Machining	Windsor	26	Non-Union	None
Hardware	Windsor	12	Non-Union	None
Dry Cleaners	Windsor	50	Non-Union	None
Hotel	Ottawa	265	Union	None
Machining	North Bay	25	Non-Union	None
Dry Cleaners	Toronto	10	Non-Union	None

Industry Type	Nearest Community	Number of Employees in Plant	Union Status	Type of Training
Machining	Midland	15	Non-Union	None
Machining	Parry Sound	46	Union	None
Machining	Toronto	341	Union	None
Chemical/Petroleum	Toronto	136	Union	None
Chemical/Petroleum	Toronto	3	Non-Union	None
Sheetmetal Fabricator	Ottawa	62	Non-Union	None
Sheetmetal Fabricator	Orillia	57	Union	None
Sheetmetal Fabricator	Bracebridge	33	Non-Union	None
Sheetmetal Fabricator	Gravenhurst	125	Union	None

EXHIBIT A:2

Selected Characteristics of Other Organizations in Which Interviews Were Conducted

Type of Organization	Location of Interview
Trade Union	Toronto
Trade Union	Toronto
Trade Union	Toronto
College of Applied Arts & Technology	Southeastern Ontario
College of Applied Arts & Technology	Northern Ontario
College of Applied Arts & Technology	Southwestern Ontario
College of Applied Arts & Technology	Central Ontario
Board of Education	Northern Ontario
Board of Education	Southwestern Ontario
Board of Education	Central Ontario
Board of Education	Southeastern Ontario
Private Trade School	Southeastern Ontario
Private Trade School	Central Ontario
Ontario Government Field Office	Southwestern Ontario
Ontario Government Field Office	Southeastern Ontario
Employer Association (Machining Industry)	Ottawa
Employer Association (Industrial Instruments Industry)	Toronto
Employer Association (Hotel and Motel Industry)	Toronto
Employer Association (Retail Hardware Industry)	Toronto
Employer Association (Dry Cleaning and Laundering Industry)	Toronto
Employer Association (Chemical Industry)	Ottawa

Appendix B: Interview Schedules

BARRIERS TO EMPLOYER SPONSORED TRAINING

INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ORGANIZATIONS WITH TRAINING PROGRAMS

PART A: D A T A P R O F I L E

Name of Firm: _____

Address: _____

_____

Regional Classification: _____

Product Orientation (see sample classifications): _____

Number of Employees in Plant: _____

Names of Unions/Employee Associations Representing Trainees: _____

_____

_____

Trade/Occupation of specific interest or concern with respect to training:
(beside each, indicate type of training involved: "CCA" for Compulsory Certification Apprenticeship, "VCA" for Voluntary Certification Apprenticeship, and "NRA" for Non-Registered Apprenticeship)

_____

_____

_____

BARRIERS TO EMPLOYER SPONSORED TRAINING

INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE: ORGANIZATIONS WITH TRAINING PROGRAMS

PART B. TECHNICAL/FINANCIAL ISSUES

1. Please indicate to what extent the following issues have affected your training program?
(Interviewer: Please prompt comments and possible government actions; space is available below)

	EFFECT				
	Very Negative	Somewhat Negative	Neither Negative nor Positive	Somewhat Positive	Very Positive
a) Return on investment of the training program to this organization.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
b) Availability of trainers for guidance, instruction, and testing.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
c) Cost of trainers for guidance, instruction, and testing...	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
d) Availability of space for training.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
e) Availability of training and learning aids.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
f) Cost of training and learning aids.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
g) Conflict between production and training schedules.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
h) Availability of administrative staff.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
i) Cost of administrative staff.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

Comments/Government Actions:

2. Any other related problems?

_____

_____

_____

PART C. TRAINEE RELATED ISSUES

1. To what extent have the following factors affected this organization's ability to attract trainees and to retain them as employees after completion of the training program?
(Interviewer: please prompt comments and possible government actions; space is available below)

	EFFECT				
	Very Negative	Somewhat Negative	Neither Negative nor Positive	Somewhat Positive	Very Positive
a) Job and career expectations of potential employees.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
b) Employee's perceived status as a trainee.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
c) Employee's perceived status as a skilled worker after training.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
d) Perceived job security in industry as a trainee/ skilled worker.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
e) Portability of skills learned from training.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
f) Difficulty for applicants to meet job or training entry requirements.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
g) Employee compensation during training.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
h) Employee compensation following training.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
i) Geographical region of the organization.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
j) Isolation of organization from urban centres.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
k) Length of the training program.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
l) Nature of tasks involved in the job.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
m) Fees or expenses that employee must pay during training...	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

1. (con't) Comments/Government Action:

2. How often do you have a shortage of applicants for your training program?

   VERY OFTEN ( ) OCCASIONALLY ( ) RARELY/NEVER ( )

3. Approximately what percentage of your trainees terminate their employment before completion of the program?_____%

   a) To your knowledge, where do most go to?

   BACK TO SCHOOL ( )

   DIFFERENT OCCUPATION ( )

   SAME OCCUPATION ELSEWHERE ( )

   UNEMPLOYMENT ( )

   OTHER (please specify)_____

4. Approximately what percentage of your trainees terminate their employment within one year following completion of the training?_____%

   a) To your knowledge, how many of these have gone to non-training employers?

   ALL/MOST ( ) SOME ( ) FEW/NONE ( )

5. What government action would you recommend to either reduce the frequency of poaching or to reduce the lost investment to the training employer?

   _____

   _____

   _____

6. Do you believe that employer sponsored training should or should not provide the trainee with portable skills within the industry?

   SHOULD ( )....(answer (a) below only)

   SHOULD NOT ( ).....(answer (b) below only)

   a) (If "should", see unions' question)....Is this sentiment generally held by employers in the industry? YES ( ) NO ( )

   b) (If "should not")....What reasons do you have for this view?

   _____

   _____

PART D. GOVERNMENT RELATED ISSUES

1. How should government (any level) and your organization divide responsibility for the following facets of training?

	Mostly Responsibility of		Both Equally
	Government	Organization	
a) Selection of on-the-job trainers.....	( )	( )	( )
b) Compensation of on-the-job trainers.....	( )	( )	( )
c) Selection of skills to be taught.....	( )	( )	( )
d) Selection of theory to be taught.....	( )	( )	( )
e) Determining length of program..	( )	( )	( )
f) Setting quality/achievement standards for the program.....	( )	( )	( )
g) Selecting trainees.....	( )	( )	( )
h) Financial support of trainees during on-the-job training.....	( )	( )	( )
i) Providing technical services (e.g. equipment, tools).....	( )	( )	( )
j) Administrative and related costs of the training program.....	( )	( )	( )
k) Financial support of trainees during institutional training..	( )	( )	( )

2. Which type of training would you like government to support more?

INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING ( )

ON-THE-JOB TRAINING ( )

NO MORE SUPPORT OF EITHER ( )

MORE SUPPORT OF BOTH ( )

DON'T KNOW/DOESN'T MATTER ( )

3. Which type of trainee evaluation should be supported by government?

TIME-BASED DECISION ( )

PROFICIENCY TESTING ( )

4. Is this organization presently supported by government in any way relating to training of employees?

YES ( ) (answer Q5-Q7) NO ( ) (move on to Q8)

(Ask Q5 to Q7 only to organizations with government support)....

5. Is this system for funding and cost-sharing satisfactory to you?

YES ( ) (answer only (a) below) NO ( ) (answer (b+c) below)

a) (If YES)....What is it about this system that makes it satisfactory?

_____

_____

b) (If NO).... What is it about this system that makes it unsatisfactory?

_____

_____

c) (if NO)....What changes would make the system of funding and cost-sharing more acceptable to this organization?

_____

_____

6. Do you deal with more than one level of government?

YES ( ) (answer Q6a) NO ( ) (move on to Q7)

a) (If YES)....Have you had any difficulties in coordinating the training program with more than one level of government?

YES ( ) (answer Q6 (i)) NO ( ) (move on to Q7)

(i) (If YES to Q4a).....Please explain nature of the difficulties and possible solutions

_____

_____

_____

7. To what extent have government guidelines affected this training program in the following ways?
(Interviewer: please prompt comments and suggestions; space is available below)

	E F F E C T				
	Very Negative	Somewhat Negative	Neither Negative nor Positive	Somewhat Positive	Very Positive
a) Ability to alter training program to adapt to changing needs of organization..	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
b) Ability of training content to cross occupational or trade jurisdictional lines.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

7. (con't)

	EFFECT				
	Very Negative	Somewhat Negative	Neither Negative nor Positive	Somewhat Positive	Very Positive
c) Amount of paperwork to be completed by organization..	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
d) Clarity of the government guidelines.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
e) Amount of time that government requires for each employee's training.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
f) Amount of time government takes to respond to correspondence.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

Comments/Suggestions:

(Ask Q8 only to organizations without government support)

8. Had you previously heard about government support programs for employer-sponsored training?

YES ( ) (answer Q8a) NO ( ) (answer Q8b)

a) (If YES)....Why have you not taken advantage of this support?

_____

_____

b) (If NO)....How could this information of government support programs be best brought to your attention?

_____

_____

PART E. EDUCATION RELATED ISSUES

1. Before they are accepted for training, must trainees take a particular course of study in school?

YES ( ) (answer Q1a) NO ( ) (move on to Q2)

a) Please give details of this program (i.e., name of program, name(s) of secondary, college, and/or trade school(s), length of pre-training education)

_____

_____

2. From your experience in employer-sponsored training, what would you say about the present education and career guidance in the school system?

EXCELLENT ( ) GOOD ( ) FAIR ( ) POOR ( ) DON'T KNOW ( )

3. Do you depend upon any educational institutions for part of your training program?

YES ( ) (answer Q4) NO ( ) (move on to Part F)

(Ask Q4 only to those who use educational institutions for part of their training program)

4. To what degree have the following issues created problems because of your relationship with the educational institutions?
(Interviewer: please prompt comments and corrective suggestions; space is provided below)

	MAJOR PROBLEM	MINOR PROBLEM	NO PROBLEM
a) Desired ratio of theory to practice..	( )	( )	( )
b) Restrictions in class size.....	( )	( )	( )
c) Operating procedures/administrative procedures of the educational institution.....	( )	( )	( )
d) Relevance of theory taught in the institution.....	( )	( )	( )
e) Relevance of skills taught in the institution.....	( )	( )	( )
f) Geographical location of the institution relative to location of trainees.	( )	( )	( )
g) Length of time for educational program	( )	( )	( )
h) Ability of institution to train employees for multi-skill jobs.....	( )	( )	( )

Comments/Suggestions:

PART F. UNION/EMPLOYEE ASSOCIATION RELATED ISSUES

(To be answered only by organizations where employees are represented by a union/employee association)

1. What effect has employee representation by a union/association had on the following aspects of training at this organization?
(Interviewer: please prompt comments; space is provided below)

	EFFECT				
	Very Negative	Somewhat Negative	Neither Negative nor Positive	Somewhat Positive	Very Positive
a) Ability to alter program to adapt to changing needs of the organization.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
b) Number of employees permitted in each training group.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
c) Type of evaluation of the trainees (i.e., time-based, proficiency test).....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
d) Length of time given to training employees.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
e) Wages to be given to trainees.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
f) Selection of applicants for training.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
g) Retention of trainees in lay-off situations.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
h) Accreditation to be given to employees.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

Comments:

2. Please describe any other issues that have caused conflict between this organization and the union/employee association with respect to the training program _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

PART G. MISCELLANEOUS ISSUES

1. Do you presently use a modular-type of training program?

   YES ( ) (answer Q1a) NO ( ) (answer Q1b)

   a) (If YES)....What incentives could be introduced by government to encourage this type of training in other organizations?

   _____

   _____

   b) (If NO)....Why not?

   _____

   _____

2. Do you believe that all firms in the industry should support employee training in some way?

   YES ( ) (do not answer Q2a) NO ( ) (answer Q2a)

   a) (If NO).....Why not?

   _____

   _____

   _____

BARRIERS TO EMPLOYER SPONSORED TRAINING

INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ORGANIZATIONS WITHOUT TRAINING PROGRAMS

PART A: D A T A P R O F I L E

Name of Firm: _____

Address: _____

_____

Regional Classification: _____

Product Orientation: _____

Number of Employees in Plant: _____

Name of Union(s)/Employee Association(s) _____

BARRIERS TO EMPLOYER SPONSORED TRAINING

INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE: ORGANIZATIONS WITHOUT TRAINING PROGRAMS

PART B. TECHNICAL/FINANCIAL ISSUES

1. Please indicate the extent to which the following issues have deterred this organization from implementing an employer sponsored training program.
(Interviewer: please prompt comments and possible government actions; space is provided below)

	Major Deterrent	Minor Deterrent	No Deterrent
a) Return on investment of a training program to this organization.....	( )	( )	( )
b) Availability of space for training.	( )	( )	( )
c) Potential conflict between production and training schedule.....	( )	( )	( )
d) Availability of training and learning aids.....	( )	( )	( )
e) Cost of training and learning aids.	( )	( )	( )
f) Availability of trainers for guidance, instruction, and testing.	( )	( )	( )
g) Cost of trainers for guidance, instruction, and testing.....	( )	( )	( )
h) Availability of administrative staff.....	( )	( )	( )
i) Cost of administrative staff.....	( )	( )	( )

Comments/Government Action:

2. Please list other major factors that have prevented this firm from implementing an employer sponsored training program

3. Has this organization ever had a training program in the past?

YES ( ) (answer Q4a) NO ( ) (move on to Part C)

a) (If YES).....Please list the major factors that resulted in the termination of that program _____

_____

_____

_____

PART C. TRAINEE RELATED ISSUES

1. Where do you attract part of your skilled workers from?

EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM ( )

OTHER FIRMS ( )

OTHER SOURCES (please specify)_____

_____

2. Do you believe that employer sponsored training should or should not provide the trainee with portable skills within the industry?

SHOULD ( ) (answer Q2a) SHOULD NOT ( ) (answer A2b)

a) (If SHOULD)....Is this sentiment generally held by employers in the industry?

YES ( ) NO ( )

b) (If SHOULD NOT).....What reasons do you have for this view?

_____

_____

_____

3. To what extent does this organization have difficulty attracting skilled labour?

MAJOR DIFFICULTY ( ) (answer Q3a)

MINOR DIFFICULTY ( ) (answer Q3a)

NO DIFFICULTY ( ) (answer Q4)

a) (If MAJOR or MINOR DIFFICULTY)....What reasons can you suggest that cause this difficulty for the organization?

_____

_____

_____

4. In your opinion, is there a shortage of skilled labour in this industry?

YES ( ) (answer Q4a) NO ( ) (move on to Part D)

a) (If YES).....What actions would you suggest government take to alleviate this shortage of skilled labour?

_____

_____

_____

PART D. GOVERNMENT RELATED ISSUES

1. In situations where government (any level) provides aid to a training program, how should government and the training organization divide responsibility for the following aspects of the training program?

	Mostly Responsibility of		Both Equally
	Government	Organization	
a) Selection of on-the-job trainers..	( )	( )	( )
b) Compensation of on-the-job trainers.....	( )	( )	( )
c) Selection of skills to be taught..	( )	( )	( )
d) Selection of theory to be taught..	( )	( )	( )
e) Determining length of the program.	( )	( )	( )
f) Setting quality/achievement standards for the program.....	( )	( )	( )
g) Selecting trainees.....	( )	( )	( )
h) Financial support of trainees during on-the-job training.....	( )	( )	( )
i) Providing technical services (e.g., equipment, tools).....	( )	( )	( )
j) Administrative and related costs of the training program.....	( )	( )	( )
k) Financial support of trainees during institutional training.....	( )	( )	( )

2. Have concerns over government assistance or regulation deterred the implementation of a training program in this organization?

YES ( ) (answer Q2a) NO ( ) (move on to Q3)

a) (If YES)....What concerns have you over government assistance or regulation? _____

_____

_____

3. Had you previously heard about government support programs for employer sponsored training?

   YES ( ) (answer Q3a) NO ( ) (answer Q3b)

   a) (If YES)....What aspects, if any, of these support programs, could be improved for the employer? _____

   _____

   _____

   b) (If NO)....How could this information about government support programs be best brought to the attention of employers?

   _____

   _____

   _____

4. What type of training would you like government to support more?

   INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING ( )

   ON-THE-JOB TRAINING ( )

   NO MORE SUPPORT OF EITHER ( )

   MORE SUPPORT OF BOTH ( )

   DON'T KNOW/DOESN'T MATTER ( )

5. What type of trainee evaluation should be supported by government?

   TIME BASED EVALUATION ( )

   PROFICIENCY TESTING ( )

PART E. EDUCATION RELATED ISSUES

1. Before they are accepted into the employ of this organization, must applicants have taken a particular course of study in school?

   YES ( ) (answer Q1a) NO ( ) (move on to Q2)

   a) (If YES)....Please give details of this program (i.e., name of program, name(s) of secondary, college, and/or trade school(s), length of pre-employment education)

   _____

   _____

   _____

2. Does this course of study satisfactorily train people for jobs in your organization?

   YES ( ) (move on to Q3) NO ( ) (answer Q2a)

   a) (If NO) What actions could government take to encourage this organization to complete the training requirements in cooperation with educational institutions?_____

3. How would you rate the present education and career guidance in the school system?

   EXCELLENT ( ) GOOD ( ) FAIR ( ) POOR ( ) DON'T KNOW ( )

PART F. UNION/EMPLOYEE ASSOCIATION RELATED ISSUES

(To be answered only by organizations with union(s)/employee association(s))

1. What has been the union/employee association stand regarding the implementation of a training program in this organization?

   ARE ENCOURAGING TRAINING ( )
   ARE DISCOURAGING TRAINING ( )
   HAVE NOT TAKEN A STAND ON TRAINING ( )

2. What conflicts, if any, do you foresee with the union/employee association if a training program was implemented in this organization?_____

3. What restrictions, if any, would the collective agreement place upon a training program in this organization?_____

BARRIERS TO EMPLOYER SPONSORED TRAINING

INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE FOR EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS*

(*includes Boards of Education, CAAT's, and Private Trade Schools)

PART A. DATA PROFILE

Name of Institution_____

Address of Institution_____

_____

Regional Classification (where applicable)_____

Is this institution involved with any employer sponsored training?

YES ( ) NO ( )

Note: Parts A and C - to be answered by all educational institutions Part B - to be answered only by educational institutions currently involved with employer sponsored training.

PART B. TO BE ANSWERED ONLY BY EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS INVOLVED WITH EMPLOYER SPONSORED TRAINING

1. To what extent have problems arisen between employers and this institution on the following issues during the process of coordination of an institutional program for trainees?
   Unless no problem is indicated, please suggest what action might be taken by government to facilitate a more cooperative relationship.

	MAJOR PROBLEM	MINOR PROBLEM	NO PROBLEM
a) Type of theory learned at the school...	( )	( )	( )
Action: _____			
_____			
_____			
b) Type of skills learned at the school...	( )	( )	( )
Action: _____			
_____			
_____			
c) Length of the school's program.....	( )	( )	( )
Action: _____			
_____			
_____			
d) Minimum educational prerequisites for trainees to be able to take the institutional program.....	( )	( )	( )
Action: _____			
_____			
_____			

	MAJOR PROBLEM	MINOR PROBLEM	NO PROBLEM
e) Institution's procedure for evaluation of trainees..... Action:_____	( )	( )	( )
f) Ability of school to teach multi-skills..... Action:_____	( )	( )	( )
g) Generality or specificity of theory and/or skills taught by the school... Action:_____	( )	( )	( )
h) Restrictions on size of group to be trained at a time..... Action:_____	( )	( )	( )
i) Adequacy of technical resources, learning aids, and equipment being used by the school for training..... Action:_____	( )	( )	( )

	MAJOR PROBLEM	MINOR PROBLEM	NO PROBLEM
j) Financial payment to be provided by employer to the school..... Action:_____	( )	( )	( )
k) Time periods slotted for institutional training (i.e., time of the day, time of the year)..... Action:_____	( )	( )	( )
l) Operating/administrative procedures used by the school..... Action:_____	( )	( )	( )

2. Please list any other problems or differences of opinion that have arisen between employers and this institution during the process of coordination of an institutional program for trainees? In each case, what action might be taken by government to facilitate a more cooperative relationship.

a) Problem:_____

Action:_____

b) Problem:_____

Action:_____

3. Is this educational institution involved directly with government (any level) in the coordination of employer sponsored training?

YES ( ) (answer Q4) NO ( ) (move on to Part C)

4. To what extent have the following issues created problems for your school in respect to government involvement in the employer sponsored program? If either a major or minor problem has occurred, please indicate what action might be taken to facilitate coordination.

	MAJOR PROBLEM	MINOR PROBLEM	NO PROBLEM
a) Strictness or laxity of government standards and guidelines..... Action:_____	( )	( )	( )
b) Number of government departments involved..... Action:_____	( )	( )	( )
c) Amount of paperwork to be completed for government..... Action:_____	( )	( )	( )
d) Clarity or ambiguity of the government standards and guidelines..... Action:_____	( )	( )	( )
e) Time required by government to respond to correspondence..... Action:_____	( )	( )	( )

	MAJOR PROBLEM	MINOR PROBLEM	NO PROBLEM
f) Government financial support of trainees in school's training program..... Action:_____	( )	( )	( )
g) Ratio of theory to practice required by government in institutional training..... Action:_____	( )	( )	( )

5. Please list any other problems that have arisen between government and the institution in the process of coordination of institutional programs for trainees. In each case, what action might be taken to facilitate coordination.

a) Problem: _____

Action: _____

b) Problem: _____

Action: _____

PART C. TO BE ANSWERED BY ALL EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

1. With particular regard to vocational training, what problems, if any, has this school had in coordinating programs with other educational institutions (i.e., secondary schools, community colleges, private trade schools, universities)? _____

2. Where problems of coordination among educational institutions do exist, what actions could be taken by government to facilitate coordination?

3. What system could you recommend for linking credits from employer and school-based training to facilitate employee mobility?

4. What actions could be taken to encourage employers to use educational institutions as part of the employer sponsored training programs?

5. What effects would modular training have upon this institution's ability to coordinate training programs with employers?

6. Generally speaking, what incentives would you recommend to make the skilled trades more attractive career choices to students?

7. What actions could be taken to help the education and career guidance system keep pace with occupational trends?

BARRIERS TO EMPLOYER SPONSORED TRAINING

INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE FOR UNIONS/EMPLOYEE ASSOCIATIONS

PART A. DATA PROFILE

Name of Association _____

_____

Address _____

_____

Regional Classification of Related Firm _____

Product Orientation of Related Firm (see SIC) _____

_____

Trade/Occupation of specific interest or concern with respect to training: (Also indicate type of training involved: "CCA" for Compulsory Certification Apprenticeship, "VCA" for Voluntary Certification Apprenticeship, "NRA" for Non-Registered Apprenticeship, and "NT for No Training).

_____

_____

_____

Note: Part A and C - to be answered by all unions/associations

Part B - to be answered only by unions/associations involved with employer sponsored training.

PART B. TO BE ANSWERED ONLY BY UNIONS/ASSOCIATIONS

INVOLVED WITH EMPLOYER SPONSORED TRAINING

1. To what extent does this union/association find problems with the present training program with respect to the following issues?
Except where there is no problem, please indicate what action could be taken to correct the situation.

	MAJOR PROBLEM	MINOR PROBLEM	NO PROBLEM
a) Cost-benefit of the training to the employee Action: _____	( )	( )	( )
b) Time periods set aside for training (i.e., after work, during work) Action: _____	( )	( )	( )
c) Theory learned from training Action: _____	( )	( )	( )
d) Skills learned from training Action: _____	( )	( )	( )
e) Selection of applicants for training Action: _____	( )	( )	( )

	MAJOR PROBLEM	MINOR PROBLEM	NO PROBLEM
f) Length of the training program.....	( )	( )	( )
Action:_____			
_____			
_____			
g) Quality/achievement standards for the program.....	( )	( )	( )
Action:_____			
_____			
_____			
h) Costs to the trainee during institutional training.....	( )	( )	( )
Action:_____			
_____			
_____			
i) Multi-skill nature of training.....	( )	( )	( )
Action:_____			
_____			
_____			
j) Ratio of theoretical to practical training.....	( )	( )	( )
Action:_____			
_____			
_____			
k) System for providing trainees credits for their successful completion of employer sponsored training.....	( )	( )	( )
Action:_____			
_____			
_____			

	MAJOR PROBLEM	MINOR PROBLEM	NO PROBLEM
l) Portability of credits given to trainees for their successful completion of employer sponsored training..... Action:_____	( )	( )	( )
m) Nature of trainee evaluation (i.e., proficiency, time-based)..... Action:_____	( )	( )	( )
n) Size of group being trained at any given time..... Action:_____	( )	( )	( )
o) Retention of trainees in lay-off situations..... Action:_____	( )	( )	( )

2. Is a modular format presently used for the training program?

YES ( ) (answer Q2a) NO ( ) (answer Q2b)

a)(If YES)....What problems, if any, have you found with modular training.

_____

_____

_____

B) (If NO)....Why not?_____

_____

3. What effects have the following factors had upon the ability to attract trainees and to retain them as employees after completion of the training program? If the factor has a negative effect, please indicate what action the firm and/or government should take, if possible, to correct the situation. Otherwise, explain why the factor has a positive or no effect.

	Very Negative	Somewhat Negative	Neither Negative nor Positive	Somewhat Positive	Very Positive
a) Job and career expectations of potential employees.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Explanation/Action:_____					
b) Employee's perceived status as a trainee.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Explanation/Action:_____					
c) Employee's perceived status as a skilled worker after training.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Explanation/Action:_____					
d) Perceived job security in the industry as a trainee/skilled worker.....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Explanation/Action:_____					

	Very Negative	Somewhat Negative	Neither Negative nor Positive	Somewhat Positive	Very Positive
e) Portability of skills learned from training.. Explanation/Action:_____ _____ _____ _____	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
f) Ability of applicants to meet entry requirements to the training program.. Explanation/Action:_____ _____ _____ _____	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
g) Employee compensation during training..... Explanation/Action_____ _____ _____ _____	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
h) Employee compensation following training..... Explanation/Action_____ _____ _____ _____	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
i) Geographical region of the employer.... ..... Explanation/Action_____ _____ _____	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

PART C. TO BE ANSWERED BY ALL UNIONS/ASSOCIATIONS

1. Does this union/association support employer sponsored training as an alternative to purely institutional training?

   YES ( ) (answer Q1a and Q1b) NO ( ) (answer Q1c)

   a) (If YES)....What sort of actions could the government take to encourage non-training employers to implement and maintain training programs?_____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   b) (If YES)....What sort of actions could government take to encourage people to apply to employer sponsored training programs rather than purely institutional training?_____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   c) (If NO)....What reasons do you have for this view?_____

   _____

   _____

   _____

2. Do you believe that employer sponsored training should or should not provide the trainee with portable skills within the industry?

   SHOULD ( )....(answer only (a) below)

   SHOULD NOT ( )....(answer only (b) below)

2. a) (If SHOULD)....What government actions would you recommend to encourage employers to teach portable skills in their training programs?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

b) (If SHOULD NOT)....What reasons do you have for this view?

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. Do you believe that all employers in the industry should or should not support employee training in some way?

SHOULD ( )

SHOULD NOT ( )

a) (If SHOULD)....What actions would you recommend government take to ensure that all employers provide training?_____

_____

_____

_____

b) (If SHOULD NOT)....What reasons do you have for this view?_____

_____

_____

_____

4. If this union/association was involved with an employer sponsored training program, what problems would you foresee arising out of the collective agreement?_____

_____

_____

_____

BARRIERS TO EMPLOYER SPONSORED TRAINING

INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE FOR GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

PART A. DATA PROFILE

Name of Government Department_____

_____

Address_____

_____

1. In situations where this government department provides (or administers) aid to a training program, how should government and the training organization divide responsibility for the following aspects of the training program?

	Mostly Responsibility of Government	Mostly Responsibility of Organization	Both Equally
a) Selection of on-the-job trainers.....	( )	( )	( )
b) Compensation of on-the-job trainers...	( )	( )	( )
c) Selection of skills to be taught.....	( )	( )	( )
d) Selection of theory to be taught.....	( )	( )	( )
e) Determining the length of the program..	( )	( )	( )
f) Setting quality/achievement standards for the program.....	( )	( )	( )
g) Selecting trainees.....	( )	( )	( )
h) Financial support of trainees during on-the-job training.....	( )	( )	( )
i) Providing technical services (e.g. equipment, tools).....	( )	( )	( )
j) Administrative and related costs of the training program.....	( )	( )	( )
k) Financial support of trainees during institutional training.....	( )	( )	( )

2. Generally speaking, what have been the employers' attitudes toward providing portable skills for trainees?

POSITIVE ( ) (answer Q2a) NEGATIVE ( ) (answer Q2a and 2b)

INDIFFERENT ( ) (answer Q2a)

a) What do you think are the reasons for these attitudes? _____

_____

b) (If NEGATIVE) What incentives could be introduced to encourage employers to teach portable skills? _____

_____

_____

113

3. What actions would you recommend to either reduce the frequency of poaching of skilled workers or to reduce the lost investment to the training employer? _____

_____

_____

4. How often have training organizations complained to you about the following issues because of government involvement? Except where there are no complaints, please indicate what action could be taken to correct the problem.

	COMMON COMPLAINT	OCCASIONAL COMPLAINT	NO COMPLAINT
a) Ability of organization to alter the training program to adapt to changing needs..... Action: _____	( )	( )	( )
b) Ability of training content to cross occupational trade jurisdictional lines..... Action: _____	( )	( )	( )
c) Amount of paperwork to be completed for government..... Action: _____	( )	( )	( )
d) Clarity of the government guidelines.. Action: _____	( )	( )	( )

5. What difficulties has this government department encountered with respect to coordination with other government departments? _____

_____

_____

_____

6. (If difficulties were mentioned above) What action could be taken to facilitate coordination with other government departments?

_____

_____

_____

7. To your knowledge, is a modular type of training readily accepted by:

a) Employers? YES ( ) NO ( ) NOT SURE ( )

b) Unions? YES ( ) NO ( ) NOT SURE ( )

c) Trainees? YES ( ) NO ( ) NOT SURE ( )

8. (If NO in any of Q7) What action could be taken to make modular training more accepted by all parties involved? _____

_____

_____

9. What major administrative problems has this government department had with respect to employer sponsored training programs? _____

_____

_____

BARRIERS TO EMPLOYER SPONSORED TRAINING

INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE FOR EMPLOYER ASSOCIATIONS

Associations Involved with Training: Answer Parts A, B. Associations Not Involved with Training: Answer Parts A, C.

PART A: Questions for ALL ASSOCIATIONS

1. Name of Association _____

2. Address _____

_____

3. Geographical Jurisdiction: Ontario ( )
   Canada ( )
   Other (please specify) _____
   _____

4. Product Orientation _____

5. Which of the following categories applies best to this association?

   ( ) Involved with the administration of employer sponsored training.

   ( ) Involved with the discussion of training with firms with training programs.

   ( ) Involved with training in ways not described above. (please specify Involvement) _____
   _____

   ( ) Not involved with employer sponsored training.

6. If association is involved with training, what type of program is used?

   ( ) Apprenticeship

   ( ) In-House

   ( ) Other (please specify)

7. Which type of training would you like government to support more?

   ( ) Institutional Training

   ( ) On-the-Job Training

   ( ) No more support of either

   ( ) More support of both

   ( ) Don't know/doesn't matter

8. Which type of trainee evaluation should be supported by government?

   ( ) Time-based decision

   ( ) Proficiency testing

9a. Do you believe that employer sponsored training should or should not provide the trainee with portable skills within the industry?

   ( ) Should

   ( ) Should Not

b. (If "should not")...What reasons do you have for this view?

10. What are your views on government involvement in industrial training? (Interviewer: please suggest issues of funding, guidelines, paperwork, and flexibility of government programs).

PART B: QUESTIONS FOR ASSOCIATIONS INVOLVED WITH TRAINING

1. Please describe your role in the training program.

2. What difficulties, if any, has the association had with the training program. (Interviewer: please suggest the following issues: a) return on investment, b) availability/cost of trainers/administrative staff/training aids, c) availability of space).

3. What government actions would you recommend to alleviate any of the above difficulties.

4. What difficulties, if any, has this association had with the ability to attract trainees and retain them as employees after completion of the training program? (Interviewer: please suggest the following issues: a) status/compensation of trainee/skilled worker, b) job security in industry, c) nature of work, d) entry requirements).

5. What government action would you recommend to either reduce the frequency of poaching or to reduce the lost investment to the training employer?

6a. Does the training program that the association is involved with depend upon any educational institution for part of the training?

( ) Yes

( ) No

b. (If "Yes")...What difficulties, if any, have arisen in the coordination of training with the educational institutions. (Interviewer: please suggest the following issues: a) type/amount of theory/skills taught at school, b) class size, c) location of school).

7. Please describe the role and attitudes of trade unions in the development and continuation of this training program.

PART C: QUESTIONS FOR ASSOCIATIONS NOT INVOLVED WITH TRAINING

1. Why has this association not been involved in employer sponsored training?

2. What government actions, if any, would you recommend to encourage training in your industry?

3. What role would you prefer this association to have in training in the industry?

4a. In your opinion, is there a shortage of skilled labour in this industry?

( ) Yes

( ) No

b. (If "Yes")...What government actions, if any, would you recommend be taken to alleviate this shortage of skilled labour?

5. What has been the stand generally taken by unions regarding the implementation of training in this industry?

( ) Are encouraging training

( ) Are discouraging training

( ) Have not taken a stand on training